DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 144 110 CS 501 679

AUTHOR Hall, Robert N., Ed.
TITLE A Symposium on Faculty, Retention, Tenure, Promotion, and Graduate Department Evaluation.
PUB DATE Apr 77
NOTE 54p.; Report prepared at Speech Communication Association; Not available in hard copy due to marginal legibility of original document

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS College Faculty; Community Colleges; Doctoral Programs; *Faculty Evaluation; Faculty Workload; *Graduate Study; Higher Education; *Job Placement; Job Tenure; Minority Group Teachers; Professional Associations; *Program Evaluation; *Speech Communication; *Symposia

ABSTRACT

This document, which focuses on practices in postsecondary speech communication programs, includes the Association for Communication Administration statement on faculty hiring, retention, and tenure. Other sections present a description and assessment of graduate degree programs in speech communication; results of a survey of job placement in the field of speech communication; guidelines for institutional self-study; a rating of specific doctoral programs in speech communication; and discussions of faculty workloads, minority placement, and the evaluation of faculty for promotion and tenure at four-year colleges and at community colleges. (CW)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED144110

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

A Symposium on Faculty Retention, Tenure, Promotion, and Graduate Department Evaluation

Robert N. Hall, Editor

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Robert N. Hall

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

CS501679

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

PROGRAM ON
PERSPECTIVES ON TENURE AND PROMOTION:

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

Jon Hall

As one reviews the literature of the last five years, even if only the ACA/ADASC *Bulletin*, one can hardly keep from seeing articles, committee reports, and position papers on such topics as accountability, personnel evaluation, tenure, promotion, and merit pay to name only a few. The advent of collective bargaining at an increasing number of institutions, my own included, has added a further dimension. Certainly, this is the decade of accountability in higher education and no where is the burden of responsibility more evident than on the shoulders of the departmental academic administrator.

Just a year ago, an article appeared in the January 1976 ACA *Bulletin* entitled,"Managing the Impossible: So You Want To Be A Department Chairperson?"[1] It provided some excellent advice to the aspiring administrator, as well as to those of us who are veterans. However, it only superficially addressed itself to the nature of the position. With such factors as collective bargaining, retrenchment, credit hours generated, performance based budgeting, the nature of the labor market and the status of the economy, the position of the academic administrator is becoming increasingly more demanding and complex.

Recognizing that all academic administrators are annually confronted with the unenviable task of assessing their staff for one of several purposes--termination or retention, tenure, promotion, merit pay, *et al.*, it seems altogether appropriate to attempt to determine and understand the policies and procedures of our colleagues. Though surely we have rather diverse evaluation procedures, perhaps even criteria, the two things that we all will acknowledge are that the task requires our commitment and is subject to continued review and improvement.

Thus, this panel was planned in an effort to share several perspectives on the topic of tenure and promotion. For organizational purposes and in an effort to provide a broad approach of interest to all academic administrators regardless of the size or nature of one's home institution, two perspectives are being presented.

The Small Four-Year College/University--Ted Walwik, Staff Coordinator of the Pennsylvania State College Educational Service Trust

The Community College--Judy Goldberg, Department of Speech, Arapahoe Community College

Though not attempting to circumvent how a panelist might wish to approach the subject area, I asked that each address two focal points

1) What criteria are and/should be used in evaluation of speech faculties and with what weight?

2) How much impact is/should the following play in the process--Ph.D. or appropriate terminal degree as a prerequisite, publication as a major criterion, peer evaluation, external evaluation.

FOOTNOTE

[1]Gerald M. Goldhaber, "Managing The Impossible: So You Want To Be A Department Chairperson?", Association for Communication Administrator's *BULLETIN*, #15, January 1976, 28-30.

PERSPECTIVES ON EVALUATION OF FACULTY
FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

Theodore J. Walwik

In deference to the announced title of this program, I should say something explicit about the particular "perspective" from which I approach the matter of evaluating faculty for promotion and/or tenure. In the Pennsylvania state college system we operate under a collective bargaining agreement. The original agreement was negotiated in 1971 and revised in 1974. As a part of the revised agreement, three commissions--each composed of two faculty members, two college presidents, and two academics from outside the system--were charged with the responsibility of developing procedures for use in the processes of faculty evaluation and development, tenure, and promotion. In the reports of these commissions several key principles can be identified which form the basis of this paper.

The first of these principles is that the process of evaluation is essentially a developmental process, subject to the control of the faculty member. The underlying assumption is that evaluation takes place, not for the purpose of enabling decisions concerning tenure, promotion, etc., but rather for the purpose of improving the faculty member's performance. The relevant article of our collective bargaining agreement is titled *Professional Development and Evaluation* and begins:

> The process of FACULTY evaluation is perceived broadly as a means for extending opportunities for continuous professional development. The processes are intended to be supportive of a FACULTY MEMBER'S desire for continuing professional growth and academic excellence.

The second principle under which we operate is that the evaluation process is separate from the process whereby hire/fire and promotion decisions are made. Structurally, this is achieved by having separate departmental committees responsible for evaluation, promotion, and tenure. The evaluation process included written critiques of classroom work by both peers and the departmental chairperson, separate reviews of the performance of non-classroom duties by peers and the departmental chairperson, and student evaluations of teaching effectiveness as demonstrated primarily through application of an instrument developed cooperatively by the faculty association, student government, and the college administration. The documents which detail these various observations and evaluations become the property of the faculty member. As will be indicated later, it then becomes the responsibility of the faculty member to bring these materials to bear upon the decision making processes for tenure and/or promotion.

A third principle fundamental to our system is that the faculty member is entitled to clearly articulated statement of criteria and standards of performance which are to be utilized in the decision making process with regard to tenure and/or promotion. In the tenure process, this begins in the pre-employment process and includes specific statements about the way in which the tenure decision is to be made, special institutional expectations, a specific statement about what is to be considered a terminal degree is this case, etc. General areas of concern are stipulated: performance of assigned duties, teaching effectiveness, mastery of subject matter, scholarly growth, and contributions to the college and/or community. Further, it is the responsibility of the college and the faculty to indicate what standard of performance is expected.

The fourth principle is that in matters such as decisions about promotion and tenure the burden of proof rests with the faculty member. That is, it is not the duty of the college, the faculty committees, or the chairperson to demonstrate that the applicant has not met the required standard. Rather, it is the responsibility of the faculty member to marshall whatever specific evidence is available to support the contention that his/her performance justifies that decision to tenure or advance in rank. To this task, the faculty member may bring not only the documents reporting critiques of teaching, evaluation of performance outside the classroom, the student evaluation, but also other forms of evidence such as copies of published material, records of distinguished contributions to professional organizations, copies of tests and syllabi, etc. Gathering this evidence is the responsibility of the faculty member.

This procedure, however, generates an additional responsibility for the college and the faculty in the development of the decision making processes. Care must be taken to insure that the standards of what is to be regarded as acceptable evidence are clearly and specifically stated.

A final principle that is fundamental to this system is that those who look at the evidence and render judgments about promotion and/or tenure must be held accountable for a carefully reasoned judgment based on a fair weighing of relevant evidence. Statements of standards, aspirations, goals and policies are guidelines for judgment; but they do not obviate judgment, and judgment in these decisions is unavoidable. The integrity of the judgmental process is enhanced by procedures which require committees and chairpersons to state the basis for the judgment. Decision makers cannot be required to prove their decisions "right," but they can be held accountable for making considered judgments based upon the available evidence.

I have spoken of the process of making judgments about tenure and promotion as being similar. In terms of the process, that is largely so. However, I regard tenure as a much more serious

question and I believe that there are some special concerns which are a part of my perspective on tenure questions.

The very concept of tenure is integral to American higher education. The historical, primary justification of tenure is its role in protecting academic freedom. An important secondary justification of tenure is that protection of enhancement of institutional quality. Third, tenure promotes a sense of collegiality by giving the faculty member a stake in the institution and its future.

The tenure decision is not a process whereby the faculty member is rewarded for past performance. Rather, it is a statement by the institution about its future and an expression of the willingness of the institution to place its future in the faculty member's hands. For this reason, tenure should not be granted simply because the faculty member has not transgressed. Rather, it should be justified on the basis of a warranted expectation of continued superior performance. This is what makes the tenure decision so difficult and so important. Not only must the applicant's past performance be considered, but also the decision making process must aim at a judgment about the future. The tenure decision is a statement of probabilities. It responds to the question, if the candidate is granted tenure will the prospect of realizing institutional aspirations be maximized?

Another specific concern that deserves consideration is the role of the terminal degree. While it is perhaps inappropriate, unreasonable, and unrealistic to require possession of the terminal degree as a condition of employment, it is entirely justified that institutions should require completion of the terminal degree before granting tenure. At the time of appointment, the college should make it clear to each candidate for employment that the possession of the appropriate terminal degree will be a critical consideration in the tenure decision process.

Experience makes it clear that those who are tenured prior to the completion of the terminal degree are less likely to press on to completion after tenure. In almost every case, it is to the advantage of the institution to stipulate clearly that possession of the appropriate terminal degree is a prerequisite for tenure. To fail to do so is to create a situation which maximizes the possibility of post-tenure difficulty in matters of faculty development and in such subsequent decisions as eligibility for promotion, sabbatical, etc.

In fact, careful consideration should be given to the problem inherent in the decision to appoint persons who do not hold a terminal degree. The case can be made that such an appointee should be excused from committee work because time must be spent on the thesis; cannot be expected to have a research program going because of work necessary to finish the degree; cannot volunteer for community service, etc. In short, the appointee without the terminal degree meets class because that is inescapable, but it would be unfair, so the reasoning goes, to require the other standards of performance. But, in such a case, nothing except the roughest judgment can be made about probable performance in many cases because there has been no actual performance in them.

Thus, while some circumstances may warrant the appointment of persons without a terminal degree, it is to the advantage of the college to make every effort to require completion of the terminal degree at the earliest possible time and certainly before tenure is granted. To do otherwise is to do potential harm to the tenure decision-making process and to increase the possibility of retaining as faculty members persons who are not optimally qualified.

Finally, I want to speak to the unique role of the department chairperson is this entire process. In our system, the chairperson makes an independent recommendation about both tenure and promotion. The reasons for this independent recommendation are important.

The chairperson has a responsibility not only to participate in the process, but also to perform the managerial task of protecting the integrity of the process. He/she must insist that the faculty members who participate in the process carry the burden of their professional and institutional responsibility. He/she must endeavor to create and maintain the conditions that encourage and facilitate professional judgment. Confidence in the system which allows peer judgment to be the key determinant in questions of such import as tenure and promotion depend upon public confidence in the rigor and integrity of the decision making process.

EVALUATION OF FACULTY IN THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Judy Goldberg

The community college comes from the community, serves the community, and becomes an integral part of the community. The topic, evaluation, presents many questions for the community college administrator: who shall evaluate, on what criteria, for which results? Community colleges are institutions of the community. Should the community assess the college's products? The community college is primarily a teaching college. Should scholarly endeavors be included in the supervisory evaluation? The community college instructor must teach from fifteen to eighteen hours, in addition to serving on committees and holding office hours. Where does the energy and time come from for the reflection and introspection necessary for self-evaluation? In many community colleges, more than fifty percent of the classes are taught by part-time faculty.[1] Should part-time faculty be evaluated on the same criteria as full-time instructors? These problems are inherent in the broad topic of evaluation in the community college. In order to address the topic, perhaps I should introduce you to profiles of typical community college students and their instructors.

Community college students differ from students in four-year institutions in a number of ways. The students in community colleges possess lower measured academic aptitudes and have less academic motivation. They come from a broader, but lower, socio-economic status. The students are less introspective and possess vague articulated goals. They have less knowledge about educational alternatives. They are less intellectually oriented, less prone to change, and show less interest in ideas and abstractions. They are more diverse both in attitudes and age.[2]

The community college instructor also presents a unique profile. The faculties of community colleges are in institutions of higher education, yet are not given time or money to pursue intellectual avenues other than the singular one of improving their teaching. Scholarship is usually approved only when it enriches teaching. Most often, when faculty members engage in research as an end to itself, those endeavors are not rewarded, nor are they deemed necessary. Community college teachers must be generalists, for they alone teach the spectrum of the discipline. Our position was adequately stated by Stephen Leacock, "He mounted his horse, and galloped off in all directions." As part of a normal load, the instructor must be prepared to teach in the community: in prisons, at military bases, at community-industrial establishments. Few instructors have a doctoral degree, most have a master's degree. Thirty-three per cent of the community college instructors were recruited from the ranks of high school teachers.[3] Community college faculties pride themselves on being primarily teachers who are interested in perfecting that art.[4]

The community college student population is unique, and the demands on its faculty are diverse. Therefore, the evaluation process, of necessity, must produce and test differing capabilities and results than other kinds of higher educational institutions.

Several kinds of evaluation procedures have proved economical and practically feasible. I would like to present several published evaluation procedures, as well as the process used at Arapahoe Community College.

A widely discussed evaluation technique is used at Golden West College in California.[5] At the time of their employment, instructors are informed of the college's intent to develop and define specific objectives for all of the institution's endeavors. Interviews between the faculty member and a supervisor are scheduled semi-annually. The instructor, along with the supervisor and dean, review the instructor's objectives. Students' tests and their scores also are analyzed. The entire meeting is conducted in a supportive atmosphere with suggestions freely given to enhance the teacher's performance in keeping with the school's goals. This plan began on an experimental basis using interested faculty and now has been adopted by the district as a valuable process which evaluates and orients the instructor while enriching and directing the institution.

Win Kelley has posited criteria for valid methods of evaluation, as well as presenting a procedural outline.[6] He asks that each instructor be rated from four different sources: administration, students, peers and self. All of these rating scales should be cooperatively written and approved. The raters should observe the teacher in the classroom with a minimum of one visitation per school year. After each classroom visit, there should be an instructor/supervisor conference, with written reports signed by the instructor and, subsequently, filed. Included in the filed report should be an analysis of the student grades given by the instructor. Instructors also should be evaluated for school and professional activity outside the classroom.

In 1968, St. John's River Junior College in Florida voted to use only student evaluations for all purposes, including merit-pay decisions. After four years, the use of student evaluations became acceptable to the total faculty. It was found that students rated favorably those teachers who were exacting, used clear objectives, and gave regular feedback.[7] The dimension of the evaluation sheet varied widely. The instrument used measures: positive personal traits (appearance, attitude), scholarship, skill of presentation, and accuracy in evaluating students (understanding and fairness).[8]

The process of evaluation at Arapahoe Community College is similar in philosophy to Kelley's. The evaluation team consists of the administrator, the instructor and two faculty members, one selected by the division and one chosen by the instructor being evaluated. The evaluation process is determined by the evaluatee. The procedure is discussed and then consensually agreed upon by the entire committee. Class visitations are conducted at mid-quarter. At this time, student evaluations also are administered. The class visitations reports are written, incorporating suggestions for improving the quality of teaching. Included in the reports are analyses and interpretations of the student evaluations. A team conference is held where the reports written by the team members are shared and discussed, with the instructor present. If the reports are approved consensually, they are signed by all present, and placed in the instructor's file. Also included in this file is a self-evaluation, course syllabi, and exam copies. The instructor has the option of including other extra material in the file.

Evaluation, ideally, should test more than the teacher's knowledge of the subject. It must also test how this knowledge is transmitted to and incorporated by the students. O'Connor and Justiz have set forth a proposal that would identify the effective instructor.[9] Their philosophy rests on the rationale that "instructors cannot be evaluated in the absence of student achievement or student outcomes."[10] The instructor's subject knowledge is held constant by providing a brief preparation time in skills with which the person has no familiarity. An hour class is then held where the skill is taught by the instructor, after which students take a post-test to measure knowledge gained. This method has value because it tests learning without contamination of evaluator bias. This also allows the learning criteria to be measured. O'Connor's procedure answers Arthur Cohen's argument that many times evaluation assesses the teacher and does not measure the teaching.[11]

Ideally, the express purpose of evaluation is to improve instruction for the student, to give direction to the instructor, and to provide a basis for personnel decisions for the administrator. Because community colleges are teaching institutions, an administrator has to evaluate both process and product. Teaching methodologies and change of student behavior also must be measured. If the evaluation is tied to continuance of contract, the teacher as a person must be evaluated. We, as evaluators, have to be aware that our conclusions, which are value judgements, are substantiated.

This paper has discussed some unique problems community college administrators can encounter when evaluation is the issue. Several evaluation procedures used at community colleges have been presented. In addition, the common criteria for productive evaluation have been reviewed: self-evaluations which include goals and objectives; classroom visitations which are objectively reported; knowledge of subject materials, as evidenced by degrees earned and professional activity; and teaching effectiveness, as measured by students' attainment of course objectives. In addition, community college instructors have to be evaluated on the dimension of student-involved dedication, and on a willingness to become participant members of the community in which they teach.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Muchmore, John & White, John, "Here's Looking at Us." *ACA Bulletin*, 17, August 1976.

[2]Trent, James E., "The Circle of Evaluation in the Community College," *Junior College Research Review*, October 1969, pp. 13-15.

[3]Grable, John, "Improving Faculty Performance," *Improving College & University Teaching*, Summer, 1974.

[4]Meyer, Art, "Community Colleges: Teachers First, Scholars Second," paper presented at the SCA Convention, 1974.

[5]Cohen, A.M. and Associates, *A Constant Variable*, (San Francisco; Jossey-Bass), 1976.

[6]Kelley, Win, "Criteria for Directing Junior College Instruction," unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, 1962.

[7]Monroe, Charles, *Profile of The Community College*, (San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 1972).

[8]Cohen, A.M. *Confronting Identity*, (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, 1972).

[9]O'Connor, E. & Justiz, T., "Identifying the Effective Instructor," ERIC, #9, 1970.

[10]*Ibid.*

[11]Cohen, *op. cit.*, 1972.

ACA STATEMENT ON HIRING, RETENTION AND TENURE

INTRODUCTION

The organizational framework of the department should facilitate a workable climate of mutual respect among faculty members and between faculty and department chairpersons. Personnel policies and procedures are an integral component of the organizational structure of the department and should serve to foster a climate of mutual recognition and concern by the department for an individual's professional development, growth, and contribution to the goals of the department.

The primary purpose of personnel policies and procedures is to facilitate departmental self-assessment and decisions based upon that assessment. A secondary aim is to assist a department to meet external guidelines and constraints, e.g., provisions in collective bargaining agreements, external monitoring agencies and their regulations, and university-wide personnel policies. It is with these broad purposes in mind that the ACA sets forth this statement in the form of recommendations.

The content of this statement is organized into four major divisions--recommendations for organization of personnel policies and procedures, recommendations for department policies and procedures for decisions on hiring, recommendations for department policies and procedures for decisions on contract renewal, and recommendations for department policies and procedures on the granting of tenure. Each major division begins with a brief discussion of assumptions and the point of view that shaped the specific recommendations. Finally, these recommendations are complementary, i.e., appropriate recommendations for hiring are additive to the recommendations for contract renewal.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE ORGANIZATION OF PERSONNEL POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

The ACA recognizes the individuality of institutions of higher education in terms of mission, goals, educational assumptions, and resources available to achieve their ends. It also recognizes that differences exist in weighting the importance of the general criteria usually employed in reaching personnel decisions, i.e., publication and other scholarly activity, teaching competence and effectiveness, and service to the university. A final source for differences that may impact on personnel policies and procedures is the diversity of academic programs that may be housed in a department, e.g., the Department of Speech Communication may have such diverse units within an administrative structure as broadcasting, cinematic arts, interpersonnel communication, public communication, theater, interpretation, speech pathology, and audiology. Thus the following set of procedures and guidelines will on the one hand provide some uniformity in the development of personnel policies and procedures for all departments of speech communication and will on the other hand permit each institution and department to accommodate the needed individuality within the guidelines.

Regardless of the individual parameters influencing the development of a department's personnel policies and procedures, such efforts should be guided by these principles:

1. personnel policies and procedures inherently involve the issue of governance;

2. that the issue of governance is best served if personnel policies and procedures are grounded in the concepts of self-regulation and self-government; and

3. that personnel policies and procedures inherently involve questions of the rights and responsibilities of individuals and institutions.

Based on these principles the ACA submits the following seven recommendations to guide the organization and development of personnel policies and procedures.

Recommendation One

Departments should adopt according to procedures established by the members of the academic department on or before a date set by the department members the constitutional statement defining faculty participation in:

1. formulating the departments criteria for recommendations;

2. determining the recommendations of the department to the university; and

3. formulating, if the department desires, an appeal mechanism to be used within the department in the areas of the selection of new faculty, the renewal of non-tenured faculty, and the granting of tenure.

Recommendation Two

If a department establishes an internal appeal mechanism, that mechanism should adhere to the following guidelines:

1. a clear statement of the type of decision which is subject to an appeal;

2. a definition of the condition(s) required to qualify for an appeal; and

3. a detailed statement of the procedure, rights, and responsibilities of participants and the method for reporting the findings and action on the appeal.

It is assumed that the faculty member must bear the burden of proof for the appeal and must do so by addressing the issues of improper procedure, or violation of academic freedom or constitutional rights, or substantively arbitrary or capricious actions.

Recommendation Three

The statement of policies and procedures by which departments shall reach decisions on hiring, contract renewal, and tenure should stipulate:

1. an identification of participants;

2. definition of the rights and responsibilities and objectives of the participants; and

3. how academic due process is assured.

17/4

Recommendation Four

The statement of policies and procedures should identify the total organizational process stipulating the levels of decision-making for the entire institution.

Recommendation Five

The statement of personnel policies and procedures should clearly specify the steps involved in the department procedures and set forth recommended guidelines applicable to a particular decision.

Recommendation Six

Personnel policies and procedures should provide specific notice as to dates for evaluation by the department of the faculty. Evaluation dates must fit into the university timetable appropriate for that particular decision.

Recommendation Seven

Personnel policies and procedures adopted shall be distributed to the members of the department at the first meeting in each year.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR DEPARTMENT POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR DECISIONS ON HIRING

The ACA recognizes that the hiring process is an allocation of a precious resource and believes the department can best maximize its potential use if a faculty vacancy is seen as part of a system in which institutional/department goals and the personal/professional goals of the hiree are in concert. The chairperson, therefore, must have the skill necessary to define departmental goals with reference to those of the institution and to translate these clearly and systematically to and for the members of the department and to the candidates.

The ACA recognizes also that the hiring process can be the first step in establishing guidelines for the initial decision of renewal of contract, and from this perspective becomes the consideration in reaching future personnel decisions. If the offer of a position is in part the basis for a decision to renew and because of possible legal questions related to the validation of standards and procedures used in the selection of an employee, the listing of the position and the offering of a position must be based upon a clear understanding and agreement on the terms of the appointment by all parties to the agreement.

The following recommendations are in the order of a chronology that usually accompanies the search and screening process and assures that a timetable has been established for the various steps prior to the actual implementation of a search. The recommendations also assume that the policies and procedures of the department have established the necessary procedures and criteria called for prior to the start of the actual search.

Recommendation One

A department must maintain a systematic and detailed written record of all decisions that pertain to the final search and selection of a faculty member.

Recommendation Two

Department personnel and policy procedures should establish a search and screening committee. The provision that establishes the committee should define the membership and how each is selected and provide guidelines for the definition for the role and task of the committee. The chairperson should be an ad hoc member of the committee with voting privileges.

Recommendation Three

A detailed position description should be developed. The description should state in functional terms what the exercise of the position is to be, thus assisting the search and screening committee with a way to evaluate candidates. A detailed position description should also contain a statement of qualifications expected for the candidate to receive serious consideration. The detailed description should also become the basis for developing a notice of vacancy, for sending and providing additional information to appropriate candidates, and for screening.

Recommendation Four

The policy and procedure should provide guidelines for the distribution of notices of vacancies.

Recommendation Five

It is the responsibility of the department to acknowledge letters of application promptly. Departments should remember that the acknowledgement is probably the candidate's first real contact with the institution. The acknowledgement should include a tentative timetable for a decision on the position. Enclosures should include a full description of the position, a full statement of qualifications for the position, and brief information about the department, university and city.

Recommendation Six

Screening and selection of candidates for initial consideration must be done in accordance with proviously established procedures and by the use of prescribed criteria. The initial screening should usually occur after the deadline date for application and the criteria for judgment must be based on previously prepared and distributed information describing the position and the qualifications necessary for candidacy. Those who either do not meet minimum qualifications or are clearly unacceptable should be notified at this stage of the search and screening process. A written record of specific grounds for rejection must be maintained by the department.

Recommendation Seven

Notice should be sent to the remaining candidates requesting submission and/or preparation of appropriate additional information. Since most resumes and placement files are often prepared before a particular position is available, it is the opinion of the ACA that the search and screening process should provide an opportunity for candidates to focus on the particular requirements of the vacancy. A partial list of additional requested information, depending on the specific needs of the position, includes;

1. evidence of teaching effectiveness;

2. copies of publications, convention papers, other evidence of scholarly activity;

3. reference for letters of recommendations. (Additional recommendation statements that may supplement statements in confidential placement files is particularly important when the position has special, unique responsibilities or needs.); and

4. additional material applicable for the particular position, e.g., a course syllabus, statement of course objectives, philosophy of evaluation of students, etc. In general, the items called for here should not be an overwhelming burden for the candidate and realistic deadlines for the candidates to provide the additional information should be provided.

Recommendation Eight

Screening and selection of candidates for final interview must be done in accordance with previously established procedure and by use of prescribed criteria. If possible, invitations should be extended to at least two candidates for an interview. An invitation, if initially offered by telephone, should be confirmed in writing with dates, length of time on campus, details of a presentation while on campus (if any), and the policy for reimbursement of expenses. If possible, an itenerary should be enclosed. Necessary materials relevant to the final interview should also be enclosed. Candidates eliminated at this stage should receive polite letters thanking them for their interest and effort but reflecting the presence of candidates more suited to the department's needs. Documentation, preferably including a paragraph of narrative or detail should be placed in the appropriate departmental files after these decisions are made.

Recommendation Nine

The purpose of the interview sessions should be clearly defined, and can be determined in part by considering:

1. Why interview this particular candidate?
2. What is it you are trying to learn?
3. What can be learned in the interview that cannot be readily perceived or probed through correspondence or on a telephone?

If at all possible, a presentation should be included as part of the interview in order to provide the department some impression of the candidate's ability to teach. Guidelines for the presentation include:

1. Material to be covered should be agreed upon in advance.
2. If the presentation cannot be scheduled as part of a regular class, every effort should be made to attract a large number of faculty and student majors in the discipline of the candidate.
3. Subject matter should be one which (1.) the candidate knows well, (2.) interests the candidate, (3.) is likely to interest the audience, and (4.) is related to the areas in which the candidate is being hired to teach.
4. Questions should be permitted.

It is advisable that the search and screening committee meet briefly after each candidate has been on campus for a brief discussion so that impressions can be shared while still fresh.

Recommendation Ten

Screening and selection of a finalist should be done in accordance with previously established procedure and by use of prescribed criteria. Reasons for the selection must be incorporated into the files; similarly, detailed notes must reflect reasons for elimination.

Recommendation Eleven

The offer of a position to a candidate should be explicit in terms of the conditions of the agreement, the performance terms of the agreement, and the evaluation procedures and criteria of the agreement.

At a minimum, the terms of the agreement should include:

1. teaching load required with, if possible, a listing of at least some of the courses to be taught;
2. level of teaching effectiveness expected, together with an explanation of the methods by which it is to be determined;
3. advising duties, undergraduate and graduate, to be assigned;
4. expected involvement, if any, in departmental activities such as forensics, theatre, special clinics, television-radio;
5. anticipations of research and publication;
6. expected participation in professional societies; and
7. advanced degrees, if any, to be secured and the dates by which they are to be in hand.

RECOMMENDATION FOR DEPARTMENT POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR DECISIONS ON APPOINTMENTS BEYOND THE FIRST YEAR

Personnel actions that pertain to faculty appointments beyond the first year represent a contiguous process, i.e., that certain requirements satisfied in terms of either the initial or the preceeding appointment, whenever is applicable, form in part the evaluative criteria. These terms speak to the criteria applied during the period of employment, thus providing faculty members with a clear indication of what is expected of them. With such knowledge, faculty members can then apply their best energies to their professional development. The department has a particular obligation to communicate whether the individual's chances for reappointment or the award of tenure are dependent on special conditions and such conditions should be stipulated.

Department personnel policies and precedures must take care to make distinctions between "dismissal" and "non-reappointment" or "nonrenewal." Dismissal is the termination of service before the end of a term contract or during a tenure appointment and places the burden of proof on the institution to demonstrate that such an action is warranted. Nonreappointment or nonrenewal is the decision not to offer a further contract of employment, or not to award tenure; it is based on the assumption that most contracts, with the exception of those that apply to individuals who already hold a grant of tenure, are for a specified length of time and does not involve bringing charges or showing "cause" why the individual's services should not be retained. The process for such a decision involves the application of relevant criteria, through a process subject to disclosure.

With this overview in mind the ACA sets forth these eight recommendations.

Recommendation One

The provisions of specific personnel policies and procedures must accommodate a range of possible decisions. The most obvious are:

1. a step toward an eventual decision as to whether to grant tenure; or
2. as an action as part of a term appointment which includes such appointments as part-time, temporary agreements which stipulate a length of time.

Recommendation Two

The evaluation of the current appointee must in part be based on the stated requirements and expectations of the preceeding conditions and terms of that appointment.

Recommendation Three

Notice of intent to evaluate should be given to the non-tenured faculty member no later than two weeks before the start of the formal evaluation period as set forth in the department personnel policies and procedures.

Recommendation Four

The non-tenured faculty members should be informed by the chairperson that they should avail themselves of the option to seek the advice and counsel from appropriate faculty members and/or of the chairperson in overcoming perceived deficiencies and in acquiring suitable material for evaluation.

Recommendation Five

While the ACA emphasizes the importance of stating specific requirements and expectations related to the position for each contract period, it recognizes that these must relate to general departmental and perhaps to institutional quantitative and qualitative standards for the evaluation of faculty performance. The ACA further recognizes that the importance assigned to each standard shall vary in accordance with the mission, goals, and objectives of the department and the institution. It is therefore imperative that departments address the definition of the qualitative and/or quantitative evidence for, and the policies and procedure for determining:

1. teaching competence and effectiveness;
2. scholarly competence and effectiveness;
3. professional competence and growth; and
4. service to the mission of the university.

Recommendation Six

The formal evaluation of each faculty member should begin with the faculty member's opportunity to review data submitted, to make a statement, and/or for the evaluators to ask questions for clarification.

Recommendation Seven

The chairperson should notify the faculty member in a conference of any decision reached pertinent to the promotion, retention or tenure of that individual.

Recommendation Eight

The ACA strongly recommends that if a decision is appealed, the burden of proof must rest upon the faculty member. This principle is necessary if a balance is to be restored between the rights of individuals and the rights of the department, and if the tenure system is to retain its traditional meaning. If a tenured faculty member is to be dismissed for cause, the burden of proof rests squarely upon the department. If the department is to assume the burden of proof in order to not offer a position to a non-tenured faculty member, the concept of a probationary term as a prerequisite to tenure becomes meaningless. Under these circumstances the department is, in effect, awarding either instant tenure or a guarantee for re-employment for a specified period of time by the mere act of hiring.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR DEPARTMENT POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR TENURE DECISIONS

The granting of tenure to an individual is one of the most significant acts of an institution of higher education. The decision follows and is based on two complementary judgments--the competence and promise of the individual and the future needs of the university. The department and university commit a portion of resources for a number of years to the skills and capacity of one individual and offer a career to develop the individual's area of competency. Because of the long term commitment of resources to future institutional needs, it is clear that tenure decisions are subject to a more strenuous, thorough, and critical review by decision-making bodies outside of the department, e.g., college tenure review committee, office of the dean, university-wide tenure review committee, office of the chief academic officer, office of the chief administrative officer, board of trustees or regents, than most other personnel decisions. All of these parties may be prone to exercise a judgment independent from that of the department.

Academic tenure is fundamental in the personnel policies of most American colleges and universities. The ACA concurs with the judgment of the Commission on Academic Tenure in Higher Education that tenure "should continue to be the characteristic form for organizing professional teaching and scholarly service in American higher education." The Commission also argues that a simple reaffirmation of the value of tenure will not suffice as an answer to its critics; rather, improvement depends essentially on a thorough examination of personnel policies and the criteria and procedures for their application and the flexibility to make changes when necessary to improve the performance of faculty decision making on questions of tenure. With preservation of tenure by strengthening the criteria and procedure as the primary goal, the ACA sets for these eight recommendations.

Recommendation One

Department personnel policies and procedures should stipulate the scope of tenure policies in terms of applicability, i.e., in terms of regular full-time, temporary, part-time, adjunct, or visiting appointments, and as to what years of service shall be cumulative in counting years toward qualification for tenure. Departmental provisions must be in accordance with institutional policy.

Recommendation Two

Department personnel policies and procedures should describe accurately and fully the actual process of a tenure decision. The process should stipulate that full disclosure of the information used shall be available to the faculty member.

Recommendation Three

The department criteria for making tenure decisions must be consistent with criteria employed by the academic administration and central administration. In order to assure acceptance of department criteria, the department should seek written approval by these bodies.

Recommendation Four

The responsibility for initiating the tenure evaluation and recommendation should rest with the basic unit in which the candidate works.

Recommendation Five

The ACA recognizes and endorses the commonly accepted principle that non-tenured faculty in competition for a limited number of tenure appointments should be disqualified from formal participation in the decisional process on grounds of interest.

Recommendation Six

While non-tenured faculty should be excluded from formal participation in the decisional process, policies and procedures should provide a method for consulting non-tenured faculty members and of reflecting their opinions in the ultimate recommendations.

Recommendation Seven

Department personnel policies and procedures should include clear criteria and a rigorous procedure for evaluating faculty as part of an on-going program of self-assessment. If additional criteria are applied and special evidence required for a tenure evaluation, these items must be so stipulated in the department personnel document.

Recommendation Eight

The ACA strongly endorses the concept that a decision to award tenure must be a
It must be a formal, explicit judgment, in which those charged by the department with that responsibility, affirm in a professional manner, after the most careful deliberations on available facts and probabilities for the future, that the individual under consideration should indeed be a permanent member of the department faculty. In keeping with the principle of collective

self-assessment, the department should neither abdicate a decision to another body by not making a clear, definite recommendation nor permit tenure to be acquired by default through the mere passage of time in service.

WORKLOAD EQUIVALENCIES AND MINORITY PLACEMENT IN SPEECH COMMUNICATION

William E. Arnold

Introduction

In 1974 the Association of Departments and Administrators in Speech Communication (now ACA) met to determine what data should be collected from departments within the field of Speech Communication. A series of questionnaires were designed to deal with key issues pertinent to administrators and their respective departments. In 1976 the first such questionnaire was tabulated and the results reported in the ACA BULLETIN.

Some information was gleaned on career placement opportunities for our students. The second major concern centered on the issues of workload reductions and on the status of minority and other placement within speech departments. To that end, a second study was undertaken.

Procedures

The purpose of this study was to determine (a) existing workload equivalencies given in respective departments; (b) departmental administrative attitudes toward workload reduction; (c) placement of minorities within respective departments and (d) the average salary by rank in departments. It should be pointed out that this survey represents the conditions that exist in the respective departments and not what administrators feel would be desirable in terms of workload equivalencies or even minority representation.

Subjects

The population for this study was departmental administrators at all institutions of higher education listed in the Speech Communication Association national files. Rather than sampling departments, the mailing list of all two-and four-year institutions was obtained from SCA and the questionnaire was sent to the respective departmental chair at all institutions. The questionnaire was sent to the chair rather than to a specifically named person. The cover letter stated the need for the study and the importance of having each and every department return the questionnaire completed. It also indicated that the expense of the study would preclude a follow-up questionnaire or additional pleas for response.

Questionnaire

Subjects were asked to respond to questions in twelve different categories. The first four questions sought demographic information on the name of the department, type of institution, the type of calendar and the type of school. Question five sought information on the number of theatre productions, forensic tournaments participated in, full-time undergraduate and full-time graduate teaching load per term. The last question in this category sought the average number of different course preparations per year per faculty member. Question area six sought attitudes toward whether or not faculty should be given release time and whether or not the ACA or SCA should take a public position on release time guidelines. Question seven asked who provided release time and question eight sought comments on workload equivalencies. Section nine dealt with specific load reductions in the area of forensics, theatre, communication disorders, academic advising, and departmental administration. Area ten sought information on the number of faculty by rank, by sex, and by ethnic background. Question eleven sought the average salary by rank from Lecturer through Full Professor. Finally, area twelve sought the number of faculty by area and degree.

The results of this study were compiled and tabulated through the use of the Arizona State University computation center.

Results

Of the institutions polled (approximately 2,222) there were 669 useable responses returned. As a part of the demographic information, Table I presents the results of the type of calendars existing in our universities, four year colleges, and two year institutions. As can be seen from the data, the semester system appears to be most popular with a number of departments indicating that they are moving to the pre-Christmas semester.

Table II indicates whether or not the institution was public or private. It appears that a fairly random sample was obtained.

Current Teaching Load

Subjects were asked to indicate the current teaching load on the undergraduate level per semester or term and the average teaching load for graduate faculty members. They were also

asked to indicate the average number of different course preparations per year. Table III presents the results of that survey. There would appear to be a fairly consistent average across the universities and four-year colleges with a higher mean for the two-year institutions.

Attitudes

To determine whether or not the ACA should take an active interest in teaching load responsibilities, administrators were asked to indicate their attitude on a five-point Likert scale to the possibility of release time for non-teaching and related activities. Table IV summerizes the results of those questions concerning departmental attitude by comparing universities with four and two year programs and the private versus public. As can be seen from the Table, the administrators were uniformly positive in their belief that release time should be given and that guidelines should be developed by the ACA.

Release Time Decision

The results of the survey indicated no clear delineation as to who provided the necessary release time decisions. They ranged all the way from the Academic Vice-President in consultation with the Dean to a decision made by the departmental chair acting either singly or in consulation with central administration. Further research should be conducted on central administration attitudes toward release time within the field of communication.

Current Load Reduction

In order to determine the existing state of the faculty load reductions in our various departments, administrators were asked to indicate the amount of reduction available for a variety of activities performed by faculty in their respective departments. Table V presents the result of existing reduction in universities, four-year colleges and two-year community colleges. As can be seen from the Table, the average reduction is approximately 3.2 hours per term or semester regardless of the total faculty teaching load. This appears fairly consistent across all institutions with universities on the average providing a bigger reduction for the activities performed. One should be reminded that this indicates what currently exists and not what ought to exist in respective departments.

Further analysis is being conducted upon the amount of reduction given for undergraduate and graduate advising and these results will be reported at a later date.

Faculty Composition

Departments were asked to indicate the number of men and women in their departments by area and by rank. Tables VI and VII report the number of men and the number of women in the various departments. The number of men and women at the professorial ranks is currently being examined and will be reported further. Unfortunately it is difficult to determine the number of departments without women since seventy-one respondents failed to make a breakdown on the basis of sex. Tables VIII, IX, X, and XI report the results of a number of ethnic minorities within each department. One can see very quickly moving from Blacks to American Indians to Spanish surnames to Orientals that the number of minorities decline significantly. Again keep in mind that this represents what is and not necessarily what ought to be.

Salary Data

Finally, the results of the salary distribution can be reported at this time. As can be seen in Table XII, the salary ranges from a median of $9,300 for a Lecturer to a maximum of $35,000 for a full professor. No delineation was made for departmental administrators, however, this could be included in a future questionnaire.

Discussion and Conclusion

Further analysis of the data to determine the number of faculty by degree in the respective area and a breakdown on the basis of sex within each of the professorial categories will be done for a future write-up. Nevertheless, the results of this study would indicate that we are in fairly poor shape in a number of regards. It would appear that our faculty are perhaps overworked both in terms of the number of preparations and the number of hours that must be taught in any one term. While we feel that it would be expedient to find some way to standardize reductions for various responsibilities, we have as a profession failed to do so. Further research by the Commission on Departmental Data should indicate what would be desirable load reductions for the various responsibilities which undertake.

It is perhaps unfortunate that we arrive at a time when there needs to be changes in our various responsibilities and load reductions when the number of faculty available for teaching at the college and university level appear to be in greater supply than in demand. The accountability movement in higher education also is going to force curtailments in budgets and in the hiring of additional faculty. While the data is currently being prepared in other disciplines throughout the country, it would appear that we do not measure up to the kind of load reductions existing in other disciplines. Perhaps this questionnaire confirms what we have known all along, that we are overworked and probably underpaid. For example, in the salary

study released at our own institution we discovered that the faculty not only in the department but in our college were an average of one to two thousand dollars lower than all other faculty within the University.

We can conclude by suggesting that this study plus the one to be completed by the Commission on Departmental Data on what ought to be the work-load equivalencies may give us the kind of data that we need to go to our central administrations for reductions and/or increases in faculty salaries. Perhaps what we need now is advice from those who have been successful in getting load reductions in their respective institutions. With their advice and with the existing data, we may be able to make the changes which have to be done. We, in addition, might make some observations in the area of ethnic and minority hiring. There would appear to be a basis for strong affirmative action programs within the field since the data does not support that we have hired very many minorities to date. This lack of hiring may reflect more on issue of the availability of minority candidates than it does any bigotry or racism within those who are charged with the responsibility of hiring. Unless we can entice and attract competent minorities to participate in our graduate programs, we will have little success in hiring minority graduates for faculty positions. It would seem to this author then that affirmative action should begin at the undergraduate level if we are to attract minorities to our graduate programs so that one day we might hire minorities to join our faculties.

In conclusion, one observation should be made about the difficulty in collecting data from our departments. While we generally agree that such information is desirable, we are often not willing to take the time to complete questionnaires in order to share information with our colleagues. I would hope that future research by the Commission on Departmental Data would meet with a greater return rate if we really feel that such data is important for our own growth and development.

TABLE I

Type of Calendar

	University	Four-Year College	Two-Year College
Semester	170 (67%)	141 (63%)	119 (66%)
Quarter	69 (27%)	33 (15%)	52 (29%)
Term	7 (3%)	13 (6%)	2 (1%)

TABLE II

Type of School

	University	Four-Year College	Two-Year College
Private	49 (195%)	164 (75%)	18 (10%)
Public	201 (79%)	54 (25%)	156 (90%)

TABLE III

Current Teaching Load and Preparations

	Undergraduate	Graduate	Prep. per year
University	11.35	9.75	3.93
4 yr. College	11.69	10.36	4.45
2 yr. College	14.96		3.35
Private	11.63	8.97	4.32
Public	12.80	10.36	3.76

TABLE IV

Attitudes Toward Work Load:

	University	4 year	2 year	Private	Public
Faculty should be given released time for non-teaching responsibilities.	1.42*	1.47	1.41	1.46	1.42
Released time guidelines should be standardized across institutions of comparable size.	2.35	2.34	2.16	2.28	2.32
The Association of Departments and Administrators in Speech Communication should take a public position on released time guidelines.	1.90	1.80	1.74	1.85	1.82
The Speech Communication Association should take a public position on released time guidelines.	1.99	1.78	1.73	1.86	1.85
N=	254	223	179	233	411

*Lower the score, the more favorable the attitude (Range 1-5)

TABLE V

Existing Reductions

	University	4-year	2-year
Forensics	3.53	2.96	3.03
Debate	2.95	3.60	1.67
Debate admin.	3.35	3.23	2.69
Production, Theatre	3.14	3.24	3.08
Theatre Administration	3.76	3.34	3.08
Technical	2.98	3.34	2.68
Scene	3.03	3.05	2.46
Costumer	3.01	3.00	2.33
Choreographer	2.85	2.93	2.00
Clinic Director	4.05	3.75	3.85
Supervision On-campus	7.00	5.07	4.80
Supervision Off-campus	3.95	4.00	4.50
Chair	5.12	3.83	4.36
Area Head	3.70	3.89	3.93

TABLE VI

Number of Men in Departments

Number	Freq	Pct	Number	Freq	Pct	Number	Freq	Pct
0.	71	11	13.	12	2	27.	1	0
1.	51	8	14.	20	3	28.	1	0
2.	97	14	15.	5	1	30.	2	0
3.	78	12	16.	6	1	31.	1	0
4.	65	10	17.	10	1	32.	1	0
5.	44	7	18.	4	1	34.	1	0
6.	41	6	19.	5	1	35.	2	0
7.	32	5	20.	3	0	36.	1	0
8.	20	3	21.	6	1	41.	2	0
9.	19	3	22.	7	1	42.	1	0
10.	12	2	23.	8	1	76.	1	0
11.	19	3	24.	4	1			
12.	13	2	25.	3	0			

TABLE VII

Number of Women in Departments

Number	Freq	Pct	Number	Freq	Pct	Number	Freq	Pct
0.	71	11	11.	19	3	22.	3	0
1.	87	13	12.	10	1	23.	1	0
2.	107	16	13.	13	2	25.	4	1
3.	76	11	14.	10	1	26.	1	0
4.	63	9	15.	6	1	29.	1	0
5.	37	6	16.	6	1	30.	1	0
6.	45	7	17.	5	1	31.	1	0
7.	24	4	18.	3	0	34.	1	0
8.	19	3	19.	5	1	36.	1	0
9.	22	3	20.	5	1	38.	1	0
10.	17	3	21.	4	1			

TABLE VIII

Number of Blacks in Department

Number	Frequency	Percentage
0	600	90
1	41	6
2	17	2.5
3	4	.6
4	1	.1
5	1	.1
6	1	.1
7	2	.3
8	1	.1
33	1	.1

TABLE IX

Number of American Indians

Number	Frequency	Percentage
0	656	9.8
1	11	1.6
3	1	.1
4	1	.1

TABLE X

Number of Spanish

Number	Frequency	Percentage
0	636	95.1
1	29	4.3
2	4	.6

TABLE XI

Number of Oriental

Number	Frequency	Percentage
0	650	97.2
1	15	2.2
2	4	.6

TABLE XII

Salary Data

Position	Median	Maximum
Lecturer	9,300	20,000
Instructor	10,500	20,000
Assistant	12,800	22,000
Associate	15,480	27,000
Full	18,900	35,000

GRADUATE PROGRAMS IN SPEECH COMMUNICATION: A POSITION PAPER

Alvin A. Goldberg

During the past twenty years major changes have occurred in the speech communication discipline. We did not even refer to our area of study, research and application as speech communication until a few years ago and our interests on both scholarly and applied levels were much more narrow and provincial in the past than they are today. Although some of the shifts that took place in recent years were influenced by fads and movements in the human relations area that are now declining in popularity, many of them such as a concern with communication processes in informal settings were of a profound and enduring nature.

The changes that occurred during the past two decades affected our discipline on many levels. To begin with, the span of our discipline was expanded to include much more than the theories and practices associated with formal speechmaking, oral interpretation, and public discussion. Interpersonal communication, group communication, organizational communication, cultural communication, and many other specialties that were peripheral two decades ago (including language behavior and communication theory) became central areas of study and application.

Although we retained our interest in rhetoric, we expanded our theoretical and conceptual interests to include scientific, non-prescriptive theorizing about many if not all aspects of the human communication process. At the present time we continue to do historical and critical research in speech communication, but we also now conduct much more scientific research involving descriptive and experimental methods. Survey research by Shirley Harmon[1] suggests that about three times as many empirical studies are currently published by SCA members than historical and critical studies.

On the applied level, members of our discipline continue to help people perform better in the delivery of formal speeches, in reading aloud, and in the making of presentations to a group or committee. But in recent years we have expanded our methodologies and applications to include training in how to interact more effectively with others in less formal face-to-face situations and in organizational settings as well.

A number of graduate programs in speech communication, including our program at the University of Denver, contributed in a significant way to these changes through the expansion of our curricula, the types of books and papers we published, and the theses, dissertations, and convention papers we encouraged. As a result, many of us who offer graduate degrees have some important responsibilities in the area of graduate education. We cannot just expand the boundaries of our discipline by offering coursework dealing with all sorts of new subjects, by using different research methods and tools, and by training people in new ways and let it go at that. By carving out additional territories we have increased our obligations; obligations that we cannot afford to ignore.

What are these obligations? It is absolutely essential, in my estimation, that graduate programs in speech communication provide much or all of the following:

1. An overview of the speech communication discipline; its history, boundaries, areas of specialization, and current status with regard to disciplinary growth and development.

2. The opportunity to obtain a thorough awareness of the speech communication literature in the student's area or areas of specialization, as well as a knowledge of relevant literature in speech communication outside of the student's specialties and in related disciplines. Students should explore the similarities and differences between speech communication and other disciplines in the subject matter covered, the questions asked, and in how the different disciplines deal with various phenomena.

3. Speech communication is currently at a stage where theory development is essential to our growth. The direction our research should take, or the relevance of studies reported in our journals dealing with such diverse topics as cognitive complexity, verbal aggressiveness, interruption behavior, self-concept, or group communication phases can only be determined by referring to some theoretical model or system. Smith[2], Hawes[3], Dance and Larson[4], and others have made important contributions in this area, and more are needed. Graduate programs should provide students with an awareness of the current status of theory development in speech communication and with the understanding and skills necessary to evaluate intelligently the theoretical and conceptual contributions of others. Coursework in theory building should be offered to assist students in contributing to the theoretical growth of our discipline.

4. Graduate programs should see to it that students obtain a thorough grounding in the research methods that are essential to an understanding of the scholarly contributions of others in the student's area of specialization. On the Ph.D. level, students should obtain sufficient methodological skill to conduct and publish research in their specialty. The Ph.D., after all, is a research degree. Furthermore, we need good research in our discipline and good research can only be done by those who know how. But even Ph.D's who have teaching positions with a community college and who do not intend and are not expected to do research by their institutions need a good understanding of research if they are to keep up with the literature in their discipline and if they are to assist others who come to them for infor-

mation and advice with regard to research. Former students of mine who entered government work as well as business and industry after earning the doctorate also report to me that their research training has been beneficial to them in their positions.[5]

5. Students should develop an ability to determine the practical implications of speech communication research findings and theoretical points of view so that the advice they give as *experts* in human communication is sound and reliable.

It is essential that graduate programs today in our discipline, because of our unique history and recent activities and involvement, encourage in an intense and deliberate manner the activities of an academic and scholarly nature I have outlined, activities that have become routine by now in other disciplines. If we as a discipline are to maintain what we have and to live up to the new set of expectations we have established for ourselves and others, it is essential that our graduate programs produce *more* than practitioners who can successfully apply their knowledge and skills in non-academic settings. Good teachers of speech communication are essential and during a period when academic positions are becoming more and more scarce it is extremely important that we better-prepare our graduate students for non-academic jobs. Nevertheless, the major focus of our graduate programs must be on matters of a more academic nature.

I take this position for two reasons. Since we do not live in an either/or world, good teaching or being an effective practitioner does not preclude sound academic training. As a matter of fact, it depends on it. Furthermore, teaching opportunities and the availability of positions in the non-academic sphere depend upon sound, academically oriented educational programs. You cannot have one without the other.

The position I have taken with regard to graduate education reflects the need I see for highly competent speech communication scholars who can make the kinds of theoretical and research contributions that will assist us in meeting the responsibilities we assumed by expanding the boundaries of our discipline and by claiming expertise in areas such as human communication theory, interpersonal communication, and group communication, areas that, until recently, we had ignored.

Once again, I recognize the need we have for first rate teachers of speech communication as well as for graduates who know how to use their knowledge and skills in non-academic settings. Our graduate program at the University of Denver is well designed to prepare students for a wide range of teaching responsibilities as well as for careers outside of the academic framework. We recently instituted graduate coursework, for example, in the area of medical communication and we are currently studying the feasibility of an internship program for both graduates and undergraduate students. However, our ultimate survival as a discipline hinges less on our ability to produce outstanding teachers or practitioners than it does on our ability through the quality of our scholarship to be what we claim to be.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Shirley Harmon, "Communication Patterns Among Scholars: Relationship To Academic Specialty and Cognitive Style" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Denver, 1969).

[2]Raymond G. Smith, *Speech Communication; Theory and Models* (New York: Harper and Row, 1970).

[3]Leonard C. Hawes, *Pragmatics of Analoging: Theory and Model Construction in Communication* (Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Pub. Co., 1975).

[4]Frank E.X. Dance and Carl Larson, *The Functions of Human Communication: A Theoretical Approach* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1976).

[5]I do not, incidentally, support the D.A. or similar degrees for students who want a teaching rather than a research degree. The D.A. degree is a waste of precious resources. Why train people who will not contribute to our development as a discipline when we could devote that same time and energy to the education of those who will? Since the number of teaching jobs is limited it is to our advantage as a discipline to fill them with individuals who have the ability and desire to contribute in a scholarly way to the discipline.

GRADUATE DEGREE PROGRAMS IN SPEECH COMMUNICATION
DESCRIPTION AND ASSESSMENT

Frank K. La Ban

The following scene might have taken place even here in San Francisco.

"Ladies, gentlemen, thank you for coming downtown today. The situation is serious and the Chairman of the Board, Mr. Pennfield Jones, and I felt a special session of the Board of Directors was needed.

"As you know, sales of our major product, the Ace Widget, are down. In fact, we are now in the seventh consecutive quarter in which sales are down and all economic indicators seem to portend more of the same in the months ahead. So this morning, the firm of Myopia, Self-Interest and Tunnel-Vision, our economic advisors, our "Money Braintrust," as it were, is going to give us the firm's thinking on how to meet the current situation. Gentlemen!"

"Thank you, J.B. As you all know, our firm was retained eleven months ago to study the business profile of the Ace Widget Manufacturing Company and to make recommendations in the light of current economic indicators. We at Myopia, Self-Interest and Tunnel-Vision have made a thorough analysis of your firm's economic performance over the last twenty-one months and this, ladies and gentlemen, is our three-point plan designed to help the Ace Widget Manufacturing Company weather the current economic crisis and to establish a firm foundation for the future.

"Number One - Establish a long range advertising campaign designed to attract applicants to the Company.

"Number Two - Begin immediately to hire additional employees to help carry out

"Number Three - A vigorous and immediate increase in production of the Ace Widget.

"Our thinking in these matters is simple: the current economic crisis, while the necessary concern of many in this country, ought not be a concern of Ace Widget Manufacturing. Besides, who knows what the market will be like a few years from now and any steps toward retrenchment or redirection might prove disastrous if and when economic conditions change. You see, we view the mission of your firm, Ace Widget, to be ....."

At this point, J.B., Chairman of the Board, interrupted Mr. Myopia, ushered him and his partners, Self-Interest and Tunnel-Vision, to the door and out of the board room. Shortly thereafter, Mr. Timid Sanity, leading spokesman for a small group of middle management at Ace Widget calling themselves ASPFEDS (Assume Sounder Policies for Economic Development and Survival) recommended an immediate moratorium on future production, expansion, and hiring of new employees until a reassessment of the current market for Ace Widgets could be made. This suggestion was applauded quietly, if not enthusiastically, by the Board of Directors.

Wise counsel, you say. Any company that cannot accurately assess the demand of its product or service ought to go under, you cry. Perhaps so. But if so, consider this. A few short years ago, in the face of declining markets for many of its graduate products, the membership of the Speech Communication Association rejected a motion put before it calling for a moratorium on the establishment of new Ph.D. programs in the field of speech.[1] Sound like a decision rendered by the firm Myopia, Self-Interest and Tunnel-Vision? Well, considering that almost all of the M.A. and Ph.D. graduates in speech seek jobs in academia, according to Dr. Robert N. Hall,[2] SCA Associate Executive Secretary and Director of the Placement Service, a moratorium, such as the one proposed, would seem to have been warranted under the circumstances. But for those of us in SCA who voted against such a proposal, perhaps we listened to the counsel of our own myopia, self-interest and tunnel-vision. But that was a few years ago. Surely conditions have changed since then. Perhaps that is so. Let us examine the evidence.

In the academic year September, 1970 - August, 1971, the SCA Placement Service listed 662 job offerings, 636 of which were "New Listings," 26 were relistings and only 37 were non-academic positions.[3] Although figures for the 1970-1971 academic year are not available in the 1975 SCA *Directory of Graduate Programs* concerning the number of M.A. and Ph.D. degrees granted in that year, the *Graduate Directory* does show that in 1969-1970, 3,607 M.A. and 511 Ph.D. degrees were granted in speech (speech being the rubric under which all speech and speech-related programs are listed) and in the 1971-1972 academic year, the *Graduate Directory* shows that 4,601 M.A. and 559 Ph. D. degrees were granted. So we might make a reasonable estimate if we said that in the year 1970-1971 approximately 3,800 to 4,000 M.A. and 500 Ph.D. degrees were granted. Also, the institutions providing summary data in the 1969-1970 year indicated that they employed 3,707 faculty members. In the same year these institutions reported graduating 4,118 potential faculty members. That, remember, in just one year.

In the academic year 1975-1976, again from September 1 to August 31, 601 jobs were listed by the SCA Placement Service, 595 of which were "New Listings" with twenty being identified as non-academic. In the same year the listing institutions granted 4,677 M.A. and 480 Ph.D. degrees, for a total of 5,157 graduate degrees. This figure compares with the 4,352 faculty members

employed by the 288 reporting departments in the 1975-1976 year. In that year alone, there were 277% more recipients of M.A. degrees than were employed in the 288 departments (4,677 - 1,686) and an additional 480 Ph.D.'s were granted which represented 18% of the total number of Ph.D.'s (2,666) employed that year as reported in the *Graduate Directory*.

As startling as these figures may be, the real impact of such data collected every two years by SCA, is revealed in the following statistics: in the years 1969-1970, 1971-1972, 1973-1974, 1975-1976 the 288 reporting institutions to SCA granted 17,734 M.A. and 2,103 Ph.D. degrees for a total of 19,837 graduate degrees granted in those four years for which data was collected. This, compared to the 4,352 departmental faculty members employed in the 1975-1976 year. That is over four and one half times (450%) of the total employed for that year in the 288 institutions reporting. But trying to gain a clear perspective concerning this data, one must realize that no statistics were collected for the years 1970-1971, 1972-1973 and 1974-1975. If we assume that only 3,500 M.A. degrees were granted in each of these years (933 below the average for the years 1969-1970, 1971-1972, 1973-1974, 1975-1976) and only 350 Ph.D. degrees in each of the years 1970-1971, 1972-1973 and 1974-1975 (some 170 below the average for the years 1969-1970, 1971-1972, 1973-1974, 1975-1976) we come out with the approximate figures of 29,234 M.A. and 3,153 Ph.D.'s with a grand total of 32,387 graduate degrees in speech granted through the years 1969-1970 and 1975-1976. That's 32,387 graduate degrees against 4,352 speech faculty employed in 288 departments in the field of speech in the 1975-1976 academic year. Somewhat of an overkill, you say? It would appear that is the case. And yet adding to the confusion is the fact that according to Robert Hall "...there are probably 406 departments offering graduate degrees; yet only 288 are listed in the *Graduate Directory* and not all of them supply the number of degrees awarded." And if this is not disheartening enough, consider the following ad which appeared in the November 15, 1976 edition of *The Chronicle of Higher Education*: "Ph.D.'s with one month residency. Total time including dissertation: one year. Doctorates in 100 fields. Southeastern Graduate School, The Institute for Innovation, University Center, Box 2473, Myrtle Beach, S.C., 29577."[5] I do not know if speech is represented in the 100 fields indicated.

But even so, what do graduate studies produce by way of usable, research, how does all this intense intellectual stimulation affect the needs of society? Here are the titles of a few of the studies in speech produced between 1969-1970 and 1975-1976.

> "Effects of Status Difference, Social Setting and Equity on the Evaluation of Persons Who Criticize Others."[6]
>
> "A Content Analysis Study of Written Communications About Social Perception: The Effect of Sentiment and Interaction Frequency Upon Plural Self-Reference and Length of Response."
>
> "An Analysis of the Frequency, Duration and Direction of Interaction Between Coaches and Players of the Interior Offensive Line of a College Football Team."

Now before you get the wrong impression, consider this speaker's own research titled "A Phonological Study of the Conchs, Original Settlers of the Florida Keys, at Three Age Levels." And I am employed--the wisdom of which I do not wish to debate.

Compare these with the following recent studies in other fields:

> "Technology in Developing Countries: The Future"
> "Swine Flu as a Hazard to Human Health"
> "Money Management"
> "Poliomyelitis in a Changing World"

If you were a legislator, which group of activities do you feel the granting of funds would be most defensible to your constituency in your state? Be honest.

So the job market is tight at the present time. What, if anything, does this mean for graduate education? Generally, we have heard of graduate programs or portions of graduate programs in speech being discontinued in the states of Washington, California, Illinois, New York. But perhaps the most sweeping cutback in graduate studies has been witnessed in Louisiana. In the November 8, 1976 issue of *The Chronical of Higher Education*, it was reported that eighteen doctoral programs were ordered ended by the Louisiana Regents. Reasons given for the cutbacks are 1) the graduate programs are generally more expensive to maintain than undergraduate programs, and 2) the job market for new Ph.D.'s has become extremely tight.[8] (I wonder how the Louisiana Regents would view 32,387 graduate degrees against 4,352 teaching positions.) I might add that the Graduate Council at the University of Arizona has recently voted to review all graduate programs from the standpoint of filling needs in the state and around the country.

The current status of job opportunities in speech versus the number of graduate degrees being awarded on a regular basis seems so out of balance at present that a reassessment of our discipline and the graduate education practices followed are in dire need of change. Opportunities other than in teaching must be found and promoted immediately. I believe a moratorium on new graduate programs, both M.A. and Ph.D., must be enacted at once, and a reduction in the number of graduate students admitted to existing programs should be limited to the truly exceptional candidates. The time to act is now. We in the discipline should prove to those controlling the purse strings that we can act responsibly, that we can put our own house in order. If we don't, we may soon find our business in the same predicament as that of the Ace Widget Company when it almost followed the advice of that self-destructive firm of Myopia, Self-Interest and Tunnel-Vision.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Personal letters from Robert N. Hall, Associate Executive Secretary, Speech Communication Association, November 11, 1976.

[2]*Ibid.*

[3]*Directory of Graduate Programs, 1975-1976* (New York: Speech Communication Association, p. vii). From this point on all references to numbers of degrees granted as well as number of faculty employed have been taken from this table.

[4]Hall, *op. cit.*

[5]*The Chronicle of Higher Education*, classified section, Volume XIII, Number 11, (November 15, 1976), p. 19.

[6]*Bibliographic Annual in Speech Communication, 1975* (New York: Speech Communication Association, pp. 200, 202, 203.)

[7]The four references listed appear in the *Blue Sheet*, published by the University of Arizona (November 29, 1976)

[8]*The Chronicle of Higher Education*, Volume XIII, Number X (November 8, 1976), p. 9.

JOB PLACEMENT: ANOTHER YEAR

Robert N. Hall

"Most of the country's large corporations appear to be planning to offer more jobs to college graduates next year (1977) than they did last June."[1] So begins an article in the New York *Times*. It was just one of several articles that have appeared in the last four months. All reports seem to indicate that 1977 college graduates face a happier future than those of years past. But one cannot help wonder just how much happier. Only when one reads past the headlines and the opening paragraphs, does the real story about the job market appear.

A recent headline in the *Chronicle* proclaimed that the job market was the best it had been in five years. Three surveys were quoted to prove the point:

> In a survey by the College Placement Council, more than 600 employers in business and government said they planned to hire 1? percent more new college graduates in 1976-77 than they did in 1975-76.
>
> ... a survey of 409 employers, found planned increases in hiring of 5 to 15 percent.
>
> Northwestern University found an increase of 16 percent in the hiring projected by 215 employers in business and industry.[2]

Then the bad news started:

> Experts warned that such increases did not herald a return to the booming job markets when most college graduates could choose among several attractive offers.
>
> While many employers commented that 1976-77 possibly could be the best recruiting year in the last four or five, they cautioned that hiring will remain selective. Top-quality candidates may have a number of offers from which to choose, while less-qualified candidates will still have difficulty finding jobs."
>
> There will be a few more jobs for college graduates than last year, but there's still some unemployment. The biggest problem will be under-employment.[3]

All of these somewhat conflicting reports were issued about the 1977 employment season; the season so important to June graduates. Yet, seven months earlier, the *Chronicle* published an article about prospects for the June, 1976, graduates. A comparison of the two articles is rather interesting:

> When tomorrow's college students graduate, they may find a more hospitable job market waiting for them, manpower experts said:
>
> The present labor-market situation, in which too many graduates are competing for too few jobs, appears to be easing.
>
> Long-range projections indicate that decreasing numbers of college graduates will have a choice of increasing numbers of jobs. The jobs, however, may not always be to their liking.
>
> The recent unemployment and underemployment of well-educated college and university graduates have created a number of problems for the labor market, as well as for the graduates.
>
> While higher education is making some attempt to solve some of the problems, it is relying heavily on employers to change the marketplace for future degree-holders.[4]

This article goes on to quote the Bureau of Labor Statistics which projected "massive over-supplies of college graduates..."[5] Obviously, the truth must lie somewhere in between these rosy statements and the gloomy projections. For some fields, placement undoubtedly is improving, fields like business administration, engineering, and accountancy. For other fields, the outlook really is not much improved. For example, the outlook for education graduates is the worst of all fields. Prospects for beginning teachers is just as bad if not worse than before. The projection for the next ten years shows little prospect for improvement for teachers.[6]

Liberal arts graduates also can expect slim pickings in the job market. The associate director of placement at the University of California asserts: "That's likely to remain true for a while because of the vast numbers in the field without any math, business courses or computer work."[7] And, to add to the problems of students like speech majors, liberal arts graduates will be at the bottom of the salary scale.

If all of these reports have validity, then the reports that women and minorities are faring better than men may be true. The reports indicate that women experienced a gain of twenty-nine percent in job offers, while averaging higher salary offers than men in the non-technical fields.[8]

In the speech communication arts and sciences, the SCA Placement Service showed a small increase in the number of positions listed in its monthly BULLETIN. This increase was matched by a decline in the number of persons using the Service. At the same time, the number of persons indicating they were still unemployed by August, 1976, showed a one percent decline over August, 1975. Tables I and II provide the data compiled for the academic year, 1975-76. As of March 1, 1977, the SCA Placement Service had recorded a vacancy listing increase of twenty-five positions over March 1, 1976. The number of persons using the Service has continued to decline from an average high of

1,600 to approximately 1,250.

Tables III and IV show not only the phenomenal growth of this profession over the last twenty years, but also show the breakdown of student enrollments at the various educational levels. Table III presents information compiled by the SCA.[9] Table IV is data compiled by the US Office of Education using the HEGIS taxonomy.[10] These two Tables present conflicting data since the HEGIS taxonomy is unclear in determining this field. The 1976 issue of the *SCA Directory of Graduate Programs* uses the new taxonomy that will be used by federal agencies in 1978.

Now the question is: where do we stand in speech communication? If one accepts the SCA figures on available faculty positions, recognizing that they do not represent the total field, then we stand in a basic static situation. There are two people in the Placement Service for every job listed. SCA's data indicates an increase in masters level student enrollment and a decrease at the doctoral level. In essence, the employment picture does not look any different this year than last.

The future, however, may not improve. This, of course, is pure speculation but more departments are seeking approval of either Ph.D. or DA programs. The ACA nor the SCA have any data that would support such proposals. In 1973, the SCA voted a moratorium on new graduate programs. The ACA Executive Committee voted in January, 1977, to "neither support nor oppose new graduate programs but to answer all requests for information by having the Staff Coordinator supply the available data as collected by the SCA Placement Service and the ACA surveys."

If a further over-supply of academic persons in speech communication is to be avoided, then all persons in the field must (1) seek-out and encourage non-academic contacts and (2) be as certain as possible that any new graduate programs truly will serve an established need. If the profession does these things, then we should begin to see an improvement in the job market.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Seth S. King, "More Jobs Expected by Colleges in 1977, New York *Times*, December 10, 1976, p. 1.

[2]Philip W. Semas, "Job Market for Graduates may be Best in 5 Years," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, December 13, 1976, p. 4.

[3]*Ibid.*

[4]Beverly T. Watkins, "Better Job Market Seen for College Graduates," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, May 10, 1976, p. 6.

[5]*Ibid.*

[6]King, *op. cit.*, p. 22.

[7]*Ibid.*

[8]"Higher Education and National Affairs," August 20, 1976, pp. 2-3.

[9]Robert N. Hall, ed., *Directory of Graduate Programs in the Speech Communication Arts and Sciences: 1977-78*, (Falls Church: SCA, 1976).

[10]*A Fact Book on Higher Education*, (Washington: ACE, 1975), p. 75.257.

TABLE I

SPEECH COMMUNICATION ASSOCIATION PLACEMENT SERVICE

Academic Year September 1, 1975 - August 31, 1976

LISTING RETRIEVAL FORM - TOTAL 601

0. New Listings 595 Relistings 6

1. STATES

12	Alabama	10	Kentucky	31	Ohio
5	Alaska	8	Louisiana	8	Oklahoma
12	Arizona	4	Maine	13	Oregon
11	Arkansas	5	Maryland	33	Pennsylvania
46	California	6	Massachusetts	-	Rhodelsland
1	Colorado	15	Michigan	6	South Carolina
5	Connecticut	11	Minnesota	3	South Dakota
1	Delaware	7	Mississippi	20	Tennessee
3	District of Columbia	21	Missouri	51	Texas
12	Florida	2	Montana	3	Utah
10	Georgia	2	Nebraska	2	Vermont
1	Guam	1	Nevada	15	Virginia
2	Hawaii	-	New Hampshire	8	Washington
3	Idaho	7	New Jersey	6	West Virginia
44	Illinois	10	New Mexico	24	Wisconsin
20	Indiana	29	New York	2	Wyoming
15	Iowa	13	North Carolina	1	Canada
18	Kansas	2	North Dakota	1	Foreign

2. TYPE OF LISTING

517	College or University
17	Community-Junior College
-	Elem/Secondary School
20	Non-Academic
31	Graduate Assistantship
16	Clinical

3. TYPE OF EMPLOYMENT

477	Regular
72	Temporary
1	Summer
20	Part-time
31	Graduate Assistantship

4. DEGREE REQUIREMENTS

8	Professional Experience
38	BA-BS-BFA
242	MA-MS-MFA
313	PhD
-	None

5. RANK OFFERED

19	Non-Academic
31	Graduate Assistantship
22	Lecturer
205	Instructor
287	Assistant Professor
30	Associate Professor
7	Professor

6. SALARY OFFERED

5	$1000+
21	$2000+
13	$3000+
2	$4000+
5	$5000+
6	$6000+
5	$7000+
30	$8000+
60	$9000+
85	$10,000+
100	$11,000+
141	$12,000+
58	$13,000+
20	$14,000+
17	$15,000+
12	$16,000+
4	$17,000+
4	$18,000+
1	$19,000+
3	$20,000+
2	$21,000+
-	$22,000+
1	$23,000+
-	$24,000+
2	$25,000+
4	Up

7. TYPE OF POSITION

9	Administrative
11	Chairmanships
514	Instructional
16	Clinical
31	Graduate Assistantship
20	Non-Academic

8. PRIMARY ASSIGNMENT

27	Rhetoric & Public Address
41	Debate
97	Fundamentals
39	General Theatre
21	Acting
18	Directing
6	History
68	Technical
67	Communication Theory
22	Interpretation
122	Radio-TV-Film
16	Pathology & Audiology
11	Communication Education
4	Language & Speech Science
31	Graduate Assistantship
3	Applied Communication
8	Other

SUMMARY DATA

August 15, 1976

SCA Placement Availability Forms

AREA	Total Persons	Women	Total PhD	Women	Total MA	Women	Total BA or None	Women
Rhetoric & Public Address	39	10	26	5	12	4	1	1
Tech Theatre	29	7	2	0	26	7	1	0
Theatre, all other	89	26	28	3	57	20	4	3
Fundamentals	53	19	6	1	45	17	2	1
Communication	99	28	47	13	49	15	3	0
Radio-TV	42	2	18	1	23	1	1	0
Debate	19	4	3	1	16	3	0	0
Interpretation	20	11	3	0	17	11	0	0
Speech Education	8	2	4	1	4	1	0	0
Speech Pathology	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Speech Sciences	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTALS	398	109	137	25	249	79	12	5

TABLE II

TABLE III

SUMMARY DATA

THE DEPARTMENTS	1968-69 Directory	1969-70 Directory	1971-72 Directory	1973-74 Directory	1975-76 Directory	1977-78 Directory
Departments represented	193	244	278	289	288	288
Institutions represented	160	190	203	206	204	207
Departments offering doctorate degree	57	75	87	93	89	88
Number of masters students	6995	9512	10,322	10,518	12,246	12,300
Number of doctoral students	1867	2449	2322	2388	2647	2337
Departmental faculty members	2969	3707	4355	4370	4352	4145
Faculty members holding doctorates	1593	1978	2332	2477	2666	2584
FEE/TUITION CHARGES						
Lowest charges	$ 9.00	27.50	39.00	39.00	10.50	12.00
Highest charges	1650.00	2300.00	2500.00	2600.00	3119.00	3900.00
Lowest charges by credit hour	5.00	7.00	9.00	10.00	8.00	12.00
Highest charges by credit hour	57.00	61.00	87.00	100.00	120.00	390.00
FINANCIAL AID OFFERED						
Lowest amount offered	100.00	110.00	50.00	100.00	50.00	100.00
Highest amount offered	8168.00	7500.00	7500.00	10,500.00	9700.00	10,764.00

FINANCIAL AID APPOINTMENTS

1967	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976	1977
3253	3904	4366	4925	5068	4720	4605	4549	4387	4234	4199

NUMBER OF DEGREES GRANTED IN:

	1967-1968	1969-1970	1971-1972	1973-1974	1975-1976
Masters	2518	3607	4601	4849	4677
Doctorates	360	511	559	553	480

TABLE IV

Year	Earned Degrees Awarded in Speech and Drama[a]				
	Bachelor's[b]			Master's (2nd Level)	Doctor's
	Total	Men	Women		
1947-48	2,488	826	1,662	541	52
1948-49	3,076	1,330	1,746	488	31
1949-50	4,269	2,321	1,948	652	43
1950-51	4,284	2,254	2,030	828	94
1951-52	3,849	1,845	2,004	885	118
1952-53	3,520	1,697	1,823	880	121
1953-54	3,418	1,653	1,765	731	147
1954-55	3,682	1,789	1,893	776	157
1955-56	3,811	1,709	2,102	827	152
1956-57	4,102	1,887	2,215	885	138
1957-58	4,394	2,051	2,343	926	124
1958-59	4,714	2,179	2,535	1,053	154
1959-60	4,924	2,116	2,808	1,117	163
1960-61	4,773	1,941	2,832	1,110	172
1961-62	4,983	1,917	3,066	1,209	197
1962-63	5,450	1,986	3,464	1,264	204
1963-64	6,376	2,234	4,142	1,424	224
1964-65	6,824	2,297	4,527	1,832	265
1965-66	7,336	2,608	4,728	2,167	276
1966-67	8,690	3,050	5,640	2,678	293
1967-68	10,200	3,376	6,824	2,835	308
1968-69	12,565	4,096	8,469	3,462	378
1969-70	13,986	5,028	8,958	3,778	413
1970-71	14,440	5,109	9,331	4,171	537
1971-72	16,015	5,591	10,424	4,612	443
1972-73	17,653	5,821	11,832	4,949	482
1973-74	19,247	6,180	13,067	5,712	441

a) Data for 1955-56 through 1963-64 are a combination of "speech and drama" and "speech correction." The latter field was first reported as a separate field of study by USOE in 1955-56. Data for 1964-65 through 1969-70 are a combination of speech and drama and speech and hearing. In 1970-71 and later the data are a combination of speech, debate, and forensic science; dramatic arts; speech pathology and audiology; and speech correction. Each is identified as a separate field of study in the 1970 HEGIS taxonomy.

b) Includes 1st-professional degrees.

Source: USOE Earned Degrees Series.

INSTITUTIONAL SELF-STUDY AND THE DEPARTMENT CHAIR

William E. Arnold

Although Roach (1976) is correct in stating that a department head may, in fact, be comparable to a blue-collar foreman in industry, he also is correct in stating that there is no well-defined job description for the academic position. Nevertheless, we are faced as department heads with a period when we will be forced to do our planning in a relatively stationary period and in a time when enrollment may continue to grow but the resources to support that enrollment will not be provided. Therefore, as suggested by the Central Michigan University self-study planning document, we will be faced with the constant systematic review of our objectives and activities coupled with close fiscal management as we continue to develop our academic programs.

It is the purpose of this paper to discuss some of the criteria and assumptions that one can use for the planning of the future in each of our academic departments. It should be stated at the onset, that the guidelines presented within this paper are gleaned from a number of institutional self-study programs and are by no means definitive. On the other hand, they can provide academic departments with questions and study outlines that may be useful if followed in a systematic way. It is in this light, then, that the following material is presented.

Institutional Priorities

The Illinois State University Committee established to assess institutional priorities, spent a semester in developing a series of twelve guidelines to help all programs within the University plan for the future. These guidelines are appropriate for any institution faced with a system of accountability and planning for the future.

Guidelines:

1. *There should be a concern for the academic content in combination with a concern for the growth and development of the learner.* As we explore academic course work, we should be concerned with the nature and type of student learner that we are designed to serve. For example, many Carnegie reports suggest that the learner of the future will not necessarily be the student from the age of 17-22. We will find more and more older citizens returning to higher education looking for new career options and new academic programs as they consider changing employment. This will be reflected in a student body from the age of 17-75. We should, therefore, look at all aspects of the leaner and not just academic content.

2. *We should develop maximal flexibility, adaptability, and employability of the programs to meet current and future conditions.* If teacher preparation programs of the 1960's taught us nothing more than that we were creating a bigger supply than there was a demand, we should keep this guideline clearly in mind. All too often, we plan curriculum based upon the existing demands in the marketplace with little foresight toward what conditions might be like five, ten, or even fifteen years from the initiation of such programs. If we develop programs which are flexible to meet the changing demands of society, we should be better able to meet the accountability pressures from governing boards and legislatures.

3. *We should be sure that we have fully qualified faculty and students for any given program so that we can maintain a program of excellence.* With a marketplace in academia based on stability and perhaps even retrenchment, we will no longer be afforded the opportunity to continue hiring new faculty with new training and new ideas. It will become increasingly important to consider existing faculty as faculty that we will have to work with for many years to come. Previous articles in the ACA *Bulletin* have suggested ways in which we can insure to some degree that faculty maintain relevance and are current with existing conditions and existing course content. As a corollary, we must maintain academic standards at the same time, trying to insure entry for minorities and others who have not had sufficient training to qualify for our respective programs.

4. *Universities must support only those programs which are excellent or have a reasonable expectation of becoming excellent.* One of the most difficult decisions of any academic administrator is the decision to curtail programs which have declining enrollment or which are mediocre in their development. Since shifts in faculty lines may occur from within a institution rather than from additions provided by governing boards, this guideline will become increasingly important. A department cannot be all things to all people and each department must assess what programs are excellent and should be maintained; what programs are weak and should be phased out.

5. *We should use student and faculty interest as one criteria for supporting academic programs within departments.* Obviously, we cannot always meet the whims of faculty and student interest as we develop our academic discipline but we should use their interests as one measure towards support and towards maintaining excellence. If your experience is like mine, each new faculty member will want to teach several courses in his or her speciality as soon as they are hired. This interest should be coupled with the overall goals of the department and general faculty and student interest within the program.

6. *There should be an inter-dependence among academic programs offered within the University.* This guideline strongly suggests that academic programs should serve not only their majors but students in other academic disciplines throughout the University. We discovered that some programs at Illinois State were serving only their majors and were even producing general education courses for their majors so that students would not have to go outside their own departments. When faced with the possibilities of cuts in academic programs, this program became highly vulnerable because it served such a select few students and did not provide a service to the rest of the university. All of us have basic introductory courses which are required or recommended by other departments and colleges throughout the university. A balance between service of one's own majors and service to other programs can insure a mutual dependence and support from other disciplines within the university.

7. *Students should be given numerous opportunities for earning credit aside from the traditional classroom learning experience.* With the opportunity for internships and externships, both within and outside the University, students should be provided these options for the development of credit. A corollary, presented by the Planning Document of Central Michigan University suggests that more faculty time should be invested in the role of critic and designer of learning experiences and that the students should assume greater responsibility for their own education. We have learned a great deal from the opportunities that students have achieved outside of the classroom and we should take advantage of these experiences. Many institutions are moving to a program of an open university and allowing students to gain credit for life experience. While I am not suggesting that we go to such a system in total, a combination of traditional classroom learning and experiencial learning outside the classroom as a means of earning credit would be desirable.

8. *The University and the academic programs within it should have a special commitment to the disadvantaged and minority learner, within the limits of academic and fiscal resources.* As department chairpersons, we have all felt the justified need of hiring minorities for our faculty. Unfortunately, there are not enough minorities with graduate training to meet the demand. This suggests very strongly that we make a commitment to minority education early on in the academic program so that more can be trained and ultimately hired for our own or for our colleagues faculty.

9. *We need to provide more information about minorities and their cultural heritage.* This suggests a stronger role for intercultural communication training within our own discipline and multicultural education throughout our universities. One can see the proliferation of courses in this area and see how this need is being met.

10. *We should insure equitable and humanistic roles for women and men as an important part of the guidelines to develop priorities within the institution.* The illustrations discussed under the guideline No. 8 can also apply here.

11. *Departments and universities should try to maintain minimial administrative structure and minimial duplication of effort.* At one time, it was desirable to have our own research courses and our own training in the social and behavioral sciences. Perhaps the time has come to indicate that this may be unnecessary duplication and could be best handled by our colleagues in other disciplines. At the same time, ways must be found to keep a minimial administrative structure so that more of the limited resources can be placed in the direct teaching of our students.

12. *Efforts must be maintained to reduce curriculum duplication possibly through cooperation with other institutions within the state or the region.* We have seen the example of numerous doctoral programs being developed within our field and perhaps to the point of unnecessary duplication of existing programs. It would be wise for us to consider cooperation with sister institutions within the state in order for each to develop those areas of excellence that they have and avoid duplicating what other institutions in the state or region have as their programs of excellence.

These guidelines are not meant to be definitive but allow for some suggestion as to the articulation of our respective academic programs. If these are kept in mind as each of us develop our own departments, we may be able to see some growth and development in our programs in spite of fiscal cutbacks and increased demands for accountability.

Specific Self-Study

In line with the above general guidelines, each of us may be faced with participation in self-study in order that our respective universities help us decide our future. Again, there are many outlines and guidelines for such self-study but I would like to include the outline which we are using currently as a part of our self-study for next year. These guidelines were developed by the central administration at Arizona State University to help us plan for review by the Board of Regents and by our own Internal Review Committee. I have included the following outline without too much explanation in order to give you an idea of some of the things that central administration and governing boards will be reviewing. Further information may be provided by direct correspondence with me.

The following outline will be used for institutional self-study within the department:

1. Goals and Objectives
   1.1 Statement of Goals

1.2 Identification of Performance Indicators
1.3 The Program Planning Process

2. Description of the Program
   2.1 History of the Program
   2.2 Program Elements
   2.3 Faculty-Student Interaction
   2.4 Cooperative Arrangements

3. Faculty Resources
   3.1 Faculty Qualifications
   3.2 Faculty Date
   3.3 Faculty Development
   3.4 Graduate Assistants and Associates

4. Student Resources
   4.1 Student Profile
   4.2 Admissions
   4.3 Enrollment
   4.4 Progress in the Graduate Program
   4.5 Graduate Student Support

5. Other Resources
   5.1 Library
   5.2 Physical Resources
   5.3 Financial Resources

6. Graduates of the Program
   6.1 Academic Information
   6.2 Doctoral Graduates
   6.3 Survey of Graduates

7. Evaluation and Planning
   7.1 Program Evaluation
   7.2 Furture Alternatives
   7.3 The Planned Program Development
   7.4 Resource Needs
   7.5 Anticipated Results of the Planned Program Development

Hopefully this list will be useful to you in terms of your own planning. In a time when we are faced with constant demands of day-to-day paperwork, we need to take time to plan for development of our academic programs one to five years in advance. I have found, at least in my own department, that the only way to do this is through faculty retreats away from campus in order to get away from the day-to-day routine. While much of the above data can be provided by an examination of records and correspondence with our own alumni, I have included some material which we use to keep track of the contributions of our faculty within the department on a year-to-year basis. The first such form, usually completed in the spring of each year, asks faculty to indicate their contribution within the categories of teaching, research, and public service. If each faculty member submits the form, it becomes very easy for the department head to systematically provide year-end reports to deans and to central administrators. I strongly urge each department head to prepare such an annual report for wide distribution if you do not already do so.

The second document asks each instructor to complete a course syllabi for each course offered. Not only does this serve to give the administrator some idea as to what is being taught in the course, but also the course syllabi can be used as a means of publicity for our academic programs with advisers throughout the University. For example, I send a set of departmental course syllabi for all courses offered in a given semester to each department and to major academic advisement centers before pre-registration for the upcoming semester. This gives the adviser more information to facilitate the advising process.

While it is not the goal of this paper to discuss faculty evaluation, I have included one form which we use to assess teaching from the perception of our students. Obviously, there are hundreds of such forms with greater or lesser degrees of reliability and validity. I think it is essential that one form be used and that data be collected systematically on each faculty member as both a part of one's academic plan and for annual review of faculty for tenure and promotion. Obviously, a systematic approach allows for some cross of faculty and departmental comparison which can be useful.

We also ask that those faculty who serve in the artistic area be evaluated by their peers as theatre directors, designers, and other such theatre functions. We have, then, developed a form for artistic proficiency which can be of some use in an area that has, for the most part, been very difficult to assess.

Finally, we have often overlooked the role of the faculty member as an academic adviser. We ask each advisee to complete on a semester-by-semester basis the enclosed form for review of the adviser. Hopefully, this information will be useful to us not only in assessing the faculty member's contribution but in helping us to plan a possible inservice workshop for faculty in

areas where advisees feel some further development is needed.

In conclusion, I have not attempted to be thorough or detailed in my analysis and suggestions for academic planning and our role as department administrators. On the other hand, I hope that the material provided herein will serve as guidelines to facilitate your role as a department head. As I began this article with a statement from Roach (1976), let me conclude with one of his major suggestions: "Precise planning, on both a long- and a short-range basis, must be constantly executed. Chairpersons must never forget that they represent their particular discipline, the administration, fellow faculty, and students--sometimes all at the same time."

GENERAL FACULTY CONTRIBUTIONS

1. Name_____

2. Department_____

3. Rank_____

4. Year appointed at institution_____

5. New degree awarded, if any_____

TEACHING

6. Teaching assignment; if you have additional comments, see Item 21.

Fall		Spring	
Course	No. of Students	Course	No. of Students

7. a. List student dissertations, theses, independent studies or special academic projects *completed* under your supervision. (Indicate whether first or second member of committees.)

b. List student dissertations, theses, independent studies or special academic projects *currently* under your supervision. (Indicate whether first or second member of committees.)

8. List significant *Departmental* responsibilities other than teaching.

9. List significant *College* responsibilities other than teaching.

10. List significant *University* responsibilities other than teaching.

11. State significant professional public service beyond the University, Include professional consulting.

12. State significant work with students outside the classroom, e.g., the sponsorship of student organizations.

13. List current memberships held in professional societies. Note any offices held or other special responsibilities and dates thereof.

14. List professional meetings attended during the past year. Include name of association, place, date.

SCHOLARLY PRODUCTIVITY

15. Advanced professional study:

a. Highest degree held at this time_____
(If this is the doctorate, go to 15d.)

b. If "a" is not the doctorate and you plan to obtain the doctorate:

i. State progress on doctorate during last year.

ii. Note present status (e.g., candidacy) and list requirements remaining for the doctorate.

iii. List advanced professional study completed that does not apply to the doctorate (e.g., institutes, other professional study and training.)

c. If you do not plan to obtain the doctorate, please explain briefly.

d. If "a" is the doctorate, list advanced professional studies completed (e.g., post-doctoral, institutes, other professional study/training.)

16. Enter your published work for the time period covered on this sheet.

List below: a) original research papers; b) performances/exhibits; c) others.

17. List papers or equivalent presented. Note title, or subject, occasion and date.

18. Indicate scholarly work in progress. Include statements concerning objectives and progress.

19. Research grants:

    a. List those submitted and pending. Include source and amount.

    b. List those received. Include source and amount.

20. List other scholarly activities not elsewhere noted, such as fellowships, awards, honors, accomplishments, contributions, etc., which you feel deserve mention.

OTHER INFORMATION

21. Any other information regarding teaching, service, and scholarly productivity which you feel is significant but is not noted elsewhere, e.g., student advising, new course preparation, new syllabi, etc. Use additional sheets if necessary.

Curriculum Syllabus

Course No. & Title:
Instructor:

Texts:

Goals:

Topics Covered:

Assignments:

Types of Examinations:

Unusual Features of the Course

STUDENT ASSESSMENT OF TEACHING

For each item listed below, answer the appropriate response on the answer sheet. DO NOT MARK ON THIS FORM.

SA If you strongly agree with the statement
A If you agree with the statement
N If you neither agree nor disagree
D If you disagree with the statement
SD If you strongly disagree with the statement

		KEY - - -	SA	A	N	D	SD
1.	The instructor was enthusiastic when presenting course material		1	2	3	4	5
2.	The instructor seemed to be interested in teaching		1	2	3	4	5
3.	The instructor's use of the examples or personal experiences helped to get points across in class		1	2	3	4	5
4.	The instructor seemed to be concerned with whether the students learned the material		1	2	3	4	5
5.	You were interested in learning the course material		1	2	3	4	5
6.	You were generally attentive in class		1	2	3	4	5
7.	You felt that this course challenged you intellectually		1	2	3	4	5
8.	You have become more competent in this area due to this course		1	2	3	4	5
9.	The instructor encouraged students to express opinions		1	2	3	4	5
10.	The instructor appeared receptive to new ideas and other's viewpoints		1	2	3	4	5
11.	The student had an opportunity to ask questions		1	2	3	4	5
12.	The instructor generally stimulated class discussion		1	2	3	4	5
13.	The instructor attempted to cover too much material		1	2	3	4	5
14.	The instructor generally presented the material too rapidly		1	2	3	4	5
15.	The take home assignments were too time consuming relative to their contribution to your understanding of the course material		1	2	3	4	5
16.	You generally found the coverage of topics in the assigned reading too difficult		1	2	3	4	5
17.	The instructor appeared to relate the course concepts in a systematic manner		1	2	3	4	5
18.	The course was well organized		1	2	3	4	5
19.	The instructor's class presentations made for easy note taking		1	2	3	4	5
20.	The direction of the course was adequately outlined		1	2	3	4	5
21.	You generally enjoyed going to class		1	2	3	4	5
22.	The instructor communicated well		1	2	3	4	5
23.	I would take this instructor for another course		1	2	3	4	5
24.	The instructor was sensitive to my needs relative to this class		1	2	3	4	5
25.	The instructor was flexible		1	2	3	4	5

26. For my preparation and ability, the level of difficulty of the course is:
    a. Very elementary
    b. Somewhat elementary
    c. About right
    d. Somewhat difficult
    e. Very difficult

27. The work load for this course in relation to other courses of equal credit is:
    a. Much lighter
    b. Lighter
    c. About the same
    d. Heavier
    e. Much heavier

28. For me, the pace at which the instructor covers the material during the term is:
    a. Very slow
    b. Somewhat slow
    c. Just about right
    d. Somewhat fast
    e. Very fast

29. Is class size satisfactory for the method of conducting the class?
    a. Yes, most of the time
    b. No, class is too large
    c. No, class is too small
    d. It doesn't make any difference one way or the other

30. Which one of the following best describes this course for you?
    a. Major requirement or elective within major field
    b. Minor requirement or required elective outside major field
    c. College requirement but not part of my major or minor field
    e. Other

31. Which one of the following was your most important reason for selecting this course?
    a. Friend(s) recommended it
    b. Faculty adviser's recommendation
    c. Teacher's excellent reputation
    d. Thought I could make a good grade
    e. It was required

32. What grade do you expect to receive in this course?
    a. A
    b. B
    c. C
    d. D
    e. No credit

33. What is your approximate cumulative grade-point average?
    a. 3.50-4.00
    b. 3.00-3.49
    c. 2.50-2.99
    d. 2.00-2.49
    e. Under 2.00

34. What is your class level?
    a. Freshman-Sophmore
    b. Junior-Senior
    c. Graduate

35. Sex
    a. Female
    b. Male

36. Did you find this form satisfactory?
    a. Yes
    b. No

37. If you would like to make additional comments about the course of instruction, use the back side of the answer sheet. You might eleaborate on the particular aspects you liked most as well as those you liked least. Also, how can the course or the way it was taught be improved? PLEASE GIVE THESE COMMENTS TO THE INSTRUCTOR.

ARTISTIC PROFICIENCY

The form similar to the below example which would include the name of the artist, his capacity (director, designer, etc.) and the name of the production.

Name of Artist:_____

Function:_____

Name of Production:_____

Dates:_____

In comparison to the highest artistic standards in theatre production of work that I have seen in both the profession and collegiate theatre, I would rate the above as: (Please check.)

Outstanding by any standard_____
Outstanding by the highest collegiate standards_____
Very good_____
Above average_____
Average_____
Below average_____
Poor_____
Do not feel qualified to evaluate this particular work_____

Remarks that would qualify above rating_____

1. The theatre faculty would routinely submit these evaluations to the chairperson.

2. Each year the theatre faculty would recommend to the chairperson a group of 5 or 6 people in the valley area who would have the artistic background and generally recognized taste to provide useful evaluations. Their opinion on the above form would be sought by the chairman in the same manner as above and separately tabulated.

3. The evaluations will be signed so that the chairperson can authenticate them, but the name will then be removed to preserve anonymity.

4. If a particular work has not been seen in the valley, the candidate may suggest other qualified people to evaluate it and the chairperson will seek the opinions of these people.

5. At the request of the faculty member, any particular work could be withdrawn from evaluation before the results are made known to the committee.

6. The use of evaluations should not preclude the candidate from submitting any other kinds of materials that would be useful to the Personnel Committee in judging the artistic excellence of this work.

1. _____as my academic adviser.

Available	: ___	: ___	: ___	: ___	: ___	: ___	: ___	: Not available
Information	: ___	: ___	: ___	: ___	: ___	: ___	: ___	: Not informed
Aware of requirements	: ___	: ___	: ___	: ___	: ___	: ___	: ___	: Not aware
Gives me plenty of time	: ___	: ___	: ___	: ___	: ___	: ___	: ___	: Gives me little time
Helpful	: ___	: ___	: ___	: ___	: ___	: ___	: ___	: Not helpful
Pleasant	: ___	: ___	: ___	: ___	: ___	: ___	: ___	: Not pleasant
Knows about classes in department	: ___	: ___	: ___	: ___	: ___	: ___	: ___	: Does not know about classes in department
Knows about classes in other departments	: ___	: ___	: ___	: ___	: ___	: ___	: ___	: Does not know about classes in other departments
Knows about instructors in department	: ___	: ___	: ___	: ___	: ___	: ___	: ___	: Does not know about instructors in department
Knows about instructors in other departments	: ___	: ___	: ___	: ___	: ___	: ___	: ___	: Does not know about instructors in other departments

Always right on advice : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Never right on advice

2. Average time spent per semester with adviser: _____hours

3. Comments:

References

Anderson, S. *et. al. Encyclopedia of Educational Evaluation* (San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 1973).

Armstrong, Harold R. *A Teacher's Guide to Teaching Performance Evaluation* (Worthington, Ohio: School Management Institute, 1972).

Arnold, W. "The Use of Communication Workshops for the Improvement of Teaching." *ACA Bulletin*, 18 (October, 1976) pp. 42-48.

Arnold, W. "Use of In-Service Workshops for Faculty Enrichment." *ACA Bulletin*, 16 (April, 1976) pp. 89-90.

Arnold, W. Use of Preview courses, *Improving College and University Teaching*, in press.

Brann, J. and T.A. Emmet, Eds. *The Academic Department or Division Chairman.* Detroit: Balamp Publishing, 1972.

Budig, G. and Rives, S. *Academic Quicksand* (Lincoln: Professional Educators Publications) 1973.

Brown, David, "Faculty Recruiting", Monograph #2, Department Chairmen Program WICHE, 1967.

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. *Less Time, More Options* (New York: McGraw Hill, 1971).

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. *New Students and New Places* (New York: McGraw Hill, 1971).

Central Michigan University, *Planning For the Future*, 1970.

Dressel, Paul. *Handbook of Academic Evaluation* San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 1976).

Dressel, P. and Farily, W. *Return to Responsibility* (San Francisco: Jossey Bass), 1972.

Ehole, Elwood B. "Selection and Evaluation of Department Chairmen." *The Educational Record*, Winter 1975, p. 29-38.

Hostrop, R. W., *et. al. Accountability for Educational Results* (Hamden, Conn: Shoe String Press, 1973).

McKeachie, W.J. "Memo to New Department Chairmen." *The Educational Record*, Spring 1968, p. 221-227.

Monson, C.H., Jr. "The University of Utah's New Department Chairmen Training Program," Monograph #4. Department Chairmen Program, WICHE, 1968.

Roach, James H.L. "Academic Department Chairperson Functions and Responsibilities" *The Educational Record* Vol. 57, (Winter, 1976), pp. 13-23.

Van Den Berghe, Pierre. *Academic Gamesmanship* (London: Abelard-Schuman, 1970).

EDITORS NOTE:

The survey which the following article reviews was commissioned by a doctoral granting department. When the authors had completed the study, they asked the ACA if the results could be reported to its membership. The Executive Committee agreed, and on December 28, 1976, Larry Barker and Renee Edwards appeared at the ACA annual business meeting to present the results of the study. After a critique by Roger Nebergall and Robert Jeffrey, and a lengthy discussion by the members present, the authors did some revising of the written report. That revision is printed here.

It is important to note that this is *not* an official ACA document. The ACA is neither responsible for the content nor the implications this study may have for departments.

Two final points: the results were by a representative random sampling and only the top 50% of each rating area are included in the tables.

A RATING OF DOCTORAL PROGRAMS IN SPEECH COMMUNICATION, 1976

Renee Edwards and Larry Barker

Unlike many of its sister disciplines in the Arts and Sciences, the field of speech communication has never conducted and published an evaluation of its doctoral programs. The speech communication discipline also does not offer any system of accreditation upon which academic deans, department chairpersons or prospective graduate students can evaluate various programs. Such information would be useful to these individuals. Students should be able to make more informed choices while academic administrators could use the data as a basis for making decisions concerning the allocation of resources. Two studies of graduate education in America sponsored by the American Council on Education (ACE) have determined the usefulness of ratings of doctoral programs to both administrators and students. Roose and Anderson, primary investigators in the second study, reported the following about the results of the earlier ACE study[1]:

> Deans of graduate schools, as well as department chairmen, have been able to support changes of emphasis within graduate schools and reallocation of financial support by reference to the rating data. It is clear too, from the many requests, that students have found in these data another factor to assist them in making decisions concerning the selection of graduate programs.[2]

The two studies by the American Council on Education provided the basis for the methodology incorporated in the present study.

Two different approaches have been employed in the evaluation of graduate education. The first has been to develop a set of objective measures such as library holdings, faculty publications, and number of grants received in departments, and apply each measure to each graduate program. The second approach, used by the ACE studies as well as the present investigation, emphasizes peer evaluation.

In order to demonstrate the validity of peer evaluation, Cartter, who conducted the first ACE study (1966), compared the results of peer ratings with various other "objective" criteria. These criteria included ratings by panels of experts, faculty salary levels, fellowships, library holdings and publication indexes. He reported,

> The departmental quality ratings were compared with publications records of scholars in those same departments. These factors were rather closely correlated, as might be anticipated. In one field of study, where confidential information was available in 45 leading departments, quality of the graduate faculty was found to be closely related to mean salaries of the top two academic ranks.[3]

Thus, peer evaluation can provide a reliable index in evaluating graduate programs. In addition, Cartter's data suggest that peer ratings tend to corroborate results obtained from objective measures in identifying the leading institutions in a discipline.

Peer evaluations, however, can extend beyond objective measures in that they reflect a broader range of quality. Cartter added,

> (Peer evaluation) appears to provide a much fairer treatment for the good but not outstanding institutions. The distribution of Woodrow Wilson and NSF fellows, Guggenheim awards, Nobel Prize winners, and other such awards is heavily skewed in favor of a few institutions and tends to exaggerate differences in quality or effectiveness.[4]

Objective measures can identify the top 10-15 departments in a field, but may not discriminate beyond that point.

Finally, any assessment of quality is ultimately a subjective determination. Quality is an elusive variable; no single index or combination of indexes can completely define the quality of an institution. However, in spite of the difficulty of evaluating programs, information about them is useful to students and administrators. Peer evaluation has been successfully used to provide such information in the past with substantial validity and reliability. The results of

the present investigation rest on the assumption that peer evaluation can provide a useful index of quality of doctoral programs. The fact that peer ratings may reflect only *one* dimension of quality is also acknowledged.

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Sample[5]

The sample is drawn from the 1975-1976 *Speech Communication Directory* which lists members of the Speech Communication Association. All subjects hold doctoral degrees and list at least one of the specified areas of mass communication, speech communication, or interpersonal communication as a major professional interest. On the basis of these two criteria, 414 subjects served as the sample. The sample was drawn by selecting three names from each page of the directory. On even numbered pages the first name on the first column, the last name on the second column, and the name nearest the midpoint were chosen. On odd numbered pages the last eligible name on the first column, the first name on the second column, and the name nearest either endpoint were chosen. When there were not three eligible names on a page, the search was continued on the following page using the same procedure, after which that page was sampled according to its even-odd pagination.

The Instrument

The instrument used for the present investigation was adapted from those used in the 1966 Cartter study and the 1970 Roose and Anderson study.

Part I requested academic and biographic data: academic rank, academic title, age, sex, the number of national and regional meetings attended in the past four years, the number of book reviews, articles, books, or monographs published since the award of one's doctorate, and the names of the institutions which granted the subject's academic degrees.

Part II was the section for rating the doctoral programs of fifty-six universities[6] on the six categories of: (1) mass communication, including broadcasting, film, and media; (2) interpersonal communication, including small groups and nonverbal; (3) speech communication, including rhetoric and public address, debate, and oral interpretation; (4) empirical, quantitative and experimental methods; (5) historical and critical methods; and (6) overall quality of doctoral program. The six point scale used for rating the programs contained the following levels: (1) distinguished, (2) strong, (3) good, (4) adequate, (5) marginal, and (6) not sufficient for doctoral training. Subjects were instructed to leave spaces blank if they did not have sufficient information to rate a program.

Part III of the instrument requested additional information. Raters were asked to identify one of the areas of mass communication, interpersonal communication, or speech communication as their major interest. They were also asked to identify their methodological interest or background. Finally, subjects were asked to rank order the top five doctoral programs, taking into account program quality in all areas.

Methods

Each randomly selected subject was mailed a questionnaire accompanied by a cover letter which explained the purpose of the study and requested participation. In addition, subjects were supplied with unstamped return envelopes with their return addresses attached to them. The decision not to provide return postage was based on financial considerations as well as the belief that subjects would be willing to take advantage of their own college or university mail service for the return mailing.

Approximately three weeks after the initial letters were sent, follow-up letters were mailed to all subjects who had not responded. These contained the questionnaire, a second letter and an unstamped marked return envelope.

RESULTS

Rate of Return

Of the original sample of 414, 227 subjects responded to the study in some form; 190 (46%) of the original sample responded to the questionnaire. Although this is a minimally acceptable rate of return, several factors can account for it not being larger. The first, which was expressed by some respondents, was that they disagreed with either the philosophy or the methodology of the study, and therefore refused to respond to the questionnaire. The second reason, which was also expressed by some subjects, was that they felt unqualified to rate doctoral programs. A third and probably more significant factor was the length of the questionnaire. Questions covered five full pages and required thought as well as time to answer. Methods which might have increased the rate of return such as repeated mailings and including return postage were limited by financial considerations.

SAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS

On the basis of Part I of the questionnaire, the following characteristics of the sample were determined:

Academic Rank

Of the 190 subjects who responded to the first question, 48% were professors, 32% were associate professors and 20% were assistant professors.

Age and Sex Characteristics

Age of the raters ranged from 25 to over 60; 67% of the 186 subjects who reported their age were spread fairly evenly between 31 and 50; 9% were younger and 23% were older. Females accounted for 11% of the return; males accounted for 89%.

Professional Meetings Attended

Only 8% of the 182 raters who responded to the question had not attended any regional meetings in the last four years. Sixty-nine per cent had attended between one and four while the remaining 24% reported attending five or more. Only 6% of the 186 subjects who responded to the question about attendance at national meetings during the last four years had not attended any; 73% had attended between one and four, and 21% had attended five or more.

Publications

Of the 181 subjects who responded to the question, 55% had not published a book review in the past four years. Twenty-nine per cent had published one or two; 16% had published three or more. Of 181 responses, 14% had not published an article since the award of their highest degree. Forty-one per cent had published between one and five; 19% had published between six and ten; 10% had published between 11 and 15; and the remaining 15% had published 16 or more.

One hundred and sixty three subjects responded to the question about books and monographs published since the award of their highest degree. Thirty-eight per cent had published none; 23% had published one; 15% had published two; 8% had published three, and the remaining 15% had published four or more.

Area of Interest

Part III of the questionnaire requested subjects to classify themselves in the areas of content and methodology included in the study. Of 183 subjects who responded to the question about their primary interest or background with respect to area of interest, 66% identified speech communication, 26% identified interpersonal communication, and 8% identified mass communication. Of the 177 subjects who responded to the question regarding methodological background or interest, 59% identified themselves as historical-critical while 41% identified their approach as empirical, quantitative or experimental.

PROGRAM EVALUATIONS

Tables I through XII contain the results of the ratings and rankings of the forty-three universities listed in the questionnaire which offer a Ph.D. in speech communication.[7] All information was tabulated except those ratings and rankings a respondent gave to the university which either employs him/her, or is his/her Ph.D. alma mater. These ratings and rankings were deleted in order to avoid bias.

Ratings

Tables I through V present the ratings made of specific programs within speech communication departments by all raters. Table I includes the ratings for programs of mass communication; Table II concerns interpersonal communication; Table III reports ratings of speech communication; Table IV reflects departments' empirical, quantitative and experimental methods; and Table V evaluates departments' historical/critical methods.

Tables VI through X present breakdowns of program ratings based on rater identifications with specific content areas and methodologies. Thus, each table presents the ratings made by those respondents who identified that area as their own interest or background in Part III of the questionnaire. In order for a score to be calculated and included, at least five respondents had to rate the program. Consequently, not all of the tables list all of the universities which offer doctoral degrees because not enough respondents rated them. Table VI presents ratings of mass communication programs by respondents in mass communication; Table VII includes ratings of interpersonal communication programs by respondents who identified that area; Table VIII reports ratings of speech communication programs by respondents in speech communication; Table IX includes ratings of empirical, quantitative and experimental methods programs by those who practice them; and Table X presents ratings of departments' historical critical methods by those who specialize in that methodology.

Table XI presents the ratings of overall quality of the doctoral programs. No breakdowns were performed on this category.

Column I of Tables I through XI lists the universities in the order of most positive to least positive score. Smaller scores reflect more positive ratings. Where two or more universities received identical means scores, they have been listed in alphabetical order and given the same rankings. Column II lists the mean ratings received by each university; Column III identifies the standard deviations; and Column IV lists the number of subjects who rated each program.

Rankings

Table XII presents the results of the rankings of programs on overall quality. Column I lists the universities in order on the basis of the number of times they were mentioned (i.e., ranked in the top five). Where schools received the same number of mentions, they are listed in alphabetical order and given identical rankings. The number of rankings is listed in Column II; the mean ranking is in Column III; and the standard deviation of rankings is provided in Column IV.

DISCUSSION

The tabular results of the study can be examined and compared in at least two different ways. First, the results of the ratings of content areas and methodologies by all respondents (Tables I through V) can be contrasted to the same ratings by those respondents who identified those areas as being within their own interest or background (Tables VI through X). This comparison shows some vast differences in some areas. The least reliable results were found in mass communication which has the smallest n in both sets of tables. Speech communication, which has the largest n, appears to have the most reliable ratings. While these differences may simply be a function of the number of responses, it is also probable that there is a "halo" effect in operation. While the "experts" (those who identify an area as their own interest or background) should make more accurate or valid appraisals of the quality of a program in their own area, other raters would tend to be influenced more by what that program has to offer in their own area--even when rating it on another area. In the present study, the "halo" effect did not influence the results of each content area or methodology equally because the numbers of subjects in each category were quite different. Since only eight per cent of the entire sample identified their background or interest as mass communication, their impact on the total results which were tabulated for all subjects is considerably smaller than that of those in speech communication who accounted for sixty-six per-cent of the sample. Consequently, a "halo" effect interacting with differences in n's of different levels of reliability demonstrated by comparing the two sets of tables (I through V and VI through X).

The second tabular comparison involves Tables XI and XII which respectively report ratings and rankings of overall quality of doctoral programs. Examination of these tables shows a great deal of similarity in ranks for the top 14 universities. Beyond this point differences appear to be affected by the small n's represented in Table XII.

In addition to considering differences in the number of responses and a possible "halo" effect, several other variables affect the interpretation of the results. In a few instances, for example, a university offered only one or two of the three content areas. As a consequence their scores probably suffered in the other areas when they did not even "claim" to be qualified in those areas. (This is especially true as it relates to mass communication; some schools such as Georgia offer a Ph.D. only in mass communication while several other universities offer degrees in the other two content areas, but not in mass communication.) A related problem occurs for those universities which offer different content areas in different departments. For these universities, ratings and rankings of overall quality must be considered on an individual basis.

Another intervening variable is the presence of "time lag" in reputations. Although departments are constantly changing, awareness or knowledge of these changes may occur several years later. Thus, evaluations made in the present study may reflect programs as they were in the past, but not necessarily as they are now. In the first ACE study Cartter considered the effect of time lag on the results and concluded that it did not have a significant effect overall. He reported

> Reputations do not seem to lag greatly for departments where a number of distinguished professors have either added to, or have departed from, the faculty. On the other hand, departments which have been changing more gradually by adding or subtracting promising younger men may experience a lag in reputation.[8]

As an example of adding or subtracting distinguished professors, Cartter reported on one department which had made some significant changes in 1962 which were reflected in the 1965 study.

Finally, a word of caution must be extended about the future use of these results. The authors suggest three recommendations in this regard: First, the scores should be considered in terms of ranges (i.e., top, middle, and bottom third) rather than perceived as scores indicative of quality to the "hundredth degree." Second, although there are minimal standards necessary for training doctoral candidates, at some point, factors other than those reflected in the ratings and rankings should be considered. These include areas of specialization, financial support, and faculty time available to students. Finally, "quality" may be defined operationally in a variety of ways. The definition in this investigation reflects only peer evaluations. While these evaluations may correlate with other measures, they are not identical to them and must be interpreted and utilized accordingly.

Beyond this point, the authors prefer to present the results without further discussion and recommend that future studies of this nature be conducted on a regular basis by some national organization within the discipline such as the Association for Communication Administration. This study, hopefully, will serve as a starting or reference point for future investigations.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Allan Murray Cartter, *An Assessment of Quality in Graduate Education* (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1966).

[2]Kenneth D. Roose and Charles J. Anderson, *A Rating of Graduate Programs* (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1970), p. 2.

[3]Cartter, p. 9.

[4]Cartter, p. 10.

[5]Altho gh the ACE studies used a form of selected stratified sampling and only surveyed members of graduate faculties, the authors of the present study elected to use a completely random sample in order to determine overall evaluations of programs. Comparisons made by Cartter between his results and those of a study in political science conducted two years prior to his and with a sample comparable to the present investigation indicated no major differences in quality of ratings.

[6]These universities were identified on the basis of their inclusion in one of several various directories. After the instrument was prepared, it was discovered that some of the universities listed do not offer a Ph.D. in Speech Communication as it is defined in this study. In addition, the 1977-78 Directory of Graduate Programs in speech communication lists six universities which were not included in this study. These are: East Tennessee State University, Renssalear Polytechnic Institute, University of California at Los Angeles, University of California at Santa Barbara, Howard University, and University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

[7]Results for the universities which do not offer a Ph.D. in communication have been omitted.

[8]Cartter, p. 9.

TABLE I. MASS COMMUNICATION

School	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	n
1. Iowa	1.98	1.10	60
2. Wisconsin	2.02	1.07	61
3. Michigan State	2.16	.99	63
4. Ohio State	2.28	1.06	58
5. Southern California	2.33	1.49	51
6. Michigan	2.42	1.39	52
7. Indiana	2.43	1.05	53
7. Temple	2.43	1.13	46
9. Texas	2.52	1.23	44
10. Northwestern	2.62	1.27	55
11. Minnesota	2.69	1.28	49
12. Ohio University	2.80	1.42	40
13. Florida State	2.83	1.22	53
13. Illinois	2.83	1.46	41
15. Massachusetts	2.85	1.06	41
16. Southern Illinois	2.88	1.38	43
17. Penn State	2.92	1.29	51
17. Purdue	2.92	1.37	51
17. New York University	2.92	1.50	25
20. Kansas	3.00	1.34	41
21. Syracuse	3.03	1.40	31
22. Missouri	3.13	1.38	31

TABLE II. INTERPERSONAL COMMUNICATION

School	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	n
1. Kansas	1.99	.96	76
2. Michigan State	2.00	1.03	84
3. Purdue	2.12	1.03	83
4. Wisconsin	2.14	1.02	69
5. Penn State	2.21	.92	75
6. Iowa	2.24	1.07	74
7. Ohio State	2.31	1.04	84
8. Northwestern	2.44	1.04	77
9. Minnesota	2.46	.96	70
10. Illinois	2.48	1.30	66
11. Southern California	2.57	1.00	63
12. Florida State	2.65	1.14	66
13. Denver	2.67	1.80	73
14. Indiana	2.68	1.06	70
15. Colorado	2.82	1.03	60
16. Temple	2.84	1.06	51
17. Michigan	2.88	1.16	68
18. Ohio University	2.89	1.27	54
19. Texas	2.91	1.10	56
20. Florida	2.93	1.26	44
21. Utah	3.00	1.07	43
22. Washington	3.04	1.29	55

TABLE III. SPEECH COMMUNICATION

School	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	n
1. Iowa	1.67	.96	91
2. Wisconsin	1.72	.92	76
3. Minnesota	1.95	.85	76
4. Penn State	1.99	.89	83
5. Northwestern	2.05	1.04	91
6. Illinois	2.08	1.04	91
7. Indiana	2.26	1.04	77
8. Ohio State	2.36	1.02	81
9. Southern California	2.38	.95	68
10. Kansas	2.40	.91	77
11. Massachusetts	2.48	1.13	66
12. Louisiana State	2.51	1.09	65
13. Purdue	2.56	1.12	84
14. Pittsburgh	2.57	.96	49
15. Michigan	2.65	1.03	75
16. Florida State	2.70	1.16	70
17. Colorado	2.75	1.01	68
18. Missouri	2.88	1.02	57
19. Temple	2.96	.99	52
20. Utah	2.98	1.03	40
21. Texas	3.01	1.25	67
22. Georgia	3.06	1.09	49

TABLE IV. EMPIRICAL, QUANTITATIVE AND EXPERIMENTAL METHODS

School	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	n
1. Michigan State	1.57	.92	84
2. Iowa	1.97	.98	74
3. Wisconsin	2.04	1.08	67
4. Ohio State	2.10	1.10	86
5. Purdue	2.13	1.08	75
6. Kansas	2.27	1.00	74
7. Florida State	2.28	1.01	72
8. Penn State	2.33	1.06	70
9. Illinois	2.35	1.22	68
10. Northwestern	2.58	1.01	71
11. Southern California	2.62	.98	60
12. Michigan	2.64	1.10	66
13. Minnesota	2.67	1.10	66
14. Indiana	2.72	1.07	67
15. Florida	2.76	1.19	45
16. Temple	2.78	1.06	49
16. Texas	2.78	1.15	50
18. Colorado	2.89	.97	53
19. Ohio University	3.06	1.24	52
20. Utah	3.12	1.03	43
21. Massachusetts	3.21	1.27	52
22. Pittsburgh	3.24	1.22	41

TABLE V. HISTORICAL CRITICAL METHODS

School	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	n
1. Wisconsin	1.55	.78	74
2. Iowa	1.60	.88	80
3. Minnesota	1.81	.77	69
4. Penn State	1.89	.89	76
5. Illinois	2.03	.92	69
5. Indiana	2.03	.97	71
7. Northwestern	2.22	.99	78
8. Massachusetts	2.25	1.15	64
9. Louisiana State	2.38	1.03	57
10. Ohio State	2.45	1.08	75
11. Kansas	2.47	1.06	66
12. Southern California	2.56	1.06	62
13. Pittsburgh	2.65	.95	43
13. Michigan	2.65	1.18	68
15. Colorado	2.72	1.08	60
16. Purdue	2.73	1.12	73
17. Temple	2.92	1.05	48
17. Missouri	2.92	.96	50
19. Florida State	3.00	1.17	58
20. Utah	3.12	.91	43
21. Ohio University	3.16	1.25	50
22. Washington	3.20	1.22	49

TABLE VI. MASS COMMUNICATION AS RATED BY RESPONDENTS IN MASS COMMUNICATION

School	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	n
1. Wisconsin	1.50	.76	8
2. Temple	1.64	1.03	11
3. Missouri	1.80	.84	5
4. Indiana	1.83	.75	6
5. Syracuse	2.00	1.12	9
6. Michigan State	2.09	.70	11
7. Michigan	2.14	1.34	7
8. Iowa	2.17	1.17	6
9. Ohio University	2.40	.97	10
10. Georgia	2.43	.79	7
10. Ohio State	2.43	1.13	7
12. Northwestern	2.56	1.33	9
13. Minnesota	2.60	1.14	5
14. Florida State	2.62	.92	8
15. Southern California	2.80	1.92	5
16. Texas	2.80	.84	5
17. Massachusetts	3.00	.82	7
18. Southern Illinois	3.12	1.73	8
19. Denver	3.17	1.33	6
19. Wayne State	3.17	1.17	6
21. Illinois	3.28	1.89	7
22. Penn State	3.50	1.31	8

TABLE VII. INTERPERSONAL COMMUNICATION AS RATED BY RESPONDENTS IN INTERPERSONAL COMMUNICATION

School	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	n
1. Michigan State	1.79	.98	24
2. Kansas	1.88	.91	26
3. Wisconsin	2.06	.87	18
4. Purdue	2.09	.97	22
5. Penn State	2.16	.75	25
6. Florida State	2.24	.77	21
6. Iowa	2.24	1.01	25
8. Illinois	2.29	1.31	17
9. Denver	2.36	1.14	22
10. Ohio State	2.41	.80	22
10. Southern California	2.41	.80	22
12. Utah	2.42	1.00	12
13. Ohio University	2.43	1.02	14
14. Indiana	2.45	1.01	22
15. Temple	2.50	.89	16
16. Minnesota	2.56	.96	16
16. Northwestern	2.56	1.12	25
18. Florida	2.62	1.19	13
19. Colorado	2.70	.73	20
20. Washington	2.89	1.41	19
21. Michigan	3.00	1.41	18
22. Buffalo	3.08	1.12	13
22. Pittsburgh	3.08	1.08	12

TABLE VIII. SPEECH COMMUNICATION AS RATED BY RESPONDENTS IN SPEECH COMMUNICATION

School	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	n
1. Iowa	1.54	.96	52
2. Wisconsin	1.72	1.15	51
3. Minnesota	1.74	.75	50
4. Penn State	1.78	.87	46
5. Northwestern	1.98	1.00	56
6. Indiana	2.19	1.14	47
7. Illinois	2.24	1.14	51
8. Ohio State	2.27	1.06	51
9. Kansas	2.33	.82	45
10. Southern California	2.38	1.00	40
11. Massachusetts	2.40	1.08	42
12. Louisiana State	2.41	1.08	44
13. Pittsburgh	2.44	1.04	32
14. Michigan	2.52	.90	48
15. Purdue	2.53	1.14	55
16. Florida State	2.70	1.26	40
17. Missouri	2.84	1.05	38
18. Texas	2.89	1.23	45
19. Colorado	2.95	1.11	40
20. Wayne State	3.03	1.36	32
21. Georgia	3.06	1.18	31
22. Temple	3.07	1.13	29

TABLE IX. EMPIRICAL, QUANTITATIVE, AND EXPERIMENTAL METHODS AS RATED BY RESPONDENTS WHO PRACTICE THEM

School	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	n
1. Michigan State	1.48	.82	40
2. Florida State	1.97	.73	33
3. Purdue	2.03	1.05	31
4. Iowa	2.06	.89	36
5. Wisconsin	2.32	1.22	28
6. Kansas	2.33	1.07	36
7. Ohio State	2.35	1.01	34
8. Penn State	2.42	1.12	33
9. Florida	2.55	1.19	20
10. Temple	2.56	.92	25
11. Illinois	2.63	1.21	27
12. Southern California	2.64	.83	28
13. Michigan	2.72	1.30	32
14. Colorado	2.77	.71	26
15. Texas	2.78	1.08	23
16. Northwestern	2.79	.95	34
17. Indiana	2.84	1.08	32
18. Oklahoma	2.91	1.02	22
19. Minnesota	2.92	1.27	27
20. Denver	2.96	1.20	24
21. Buffalo	3.21	1.42	6
22. Utah	3.24	1.18	17

TABLE X. HISTORICAL CRITICAL METHODS AS RATED BY RESPONDENTS WHO PRACTICE THEM

School	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	n
1. Wisconsin	1.50	.83	42
2. Iowa	1.55	.96	40
3. Minnesota	1.59	.55	37
4. Penn State	1.61	.75	38
5. Massachusetts	1.91	1.01	35
6. Indiana	2.00	1.03	35
7. Northwestern	2.14	1.12	36
8. Illinois	2.19	1.04	36
9. Kansas	2.31	1.05	35
10. Ohio State	2.32	1.12	40
11. Louisiana State	2.34	1.08	29
12. Michigan	2.37	1.16	35
13. Southern California	2.42	1.12	31
14. Pittsburgh	2.50	1.06	24
15. Purdue	2.72	1.19	39
16. Colorado	2.81	1.22	31
17. Georgia	2.86	1.21	22
18. Missouri	2.87	.92	23
19. Temple	2.91	1.15	22
20. Wayne State	3.08	1.15	25
21. Utah	3.13	.92	23
21. Washington	3.13	1.20	22

TABLE XI. RATINGS OF OVERALL QUALITY

School	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	n
1. Iowa	1.74	.86	103
2. Wisconsin	1.81	.93	96
3. Penn State	2.00	.86	91
4. Illinois	2.16	1.02	92
5. Minnesota	2.18	.75	89
6. Ohio State	2.22	.92	103
7. Michigan State	2.28	1.00	97
7. Northwestern	2.28	.94	96
9. Purdue	2.35	1.07	92
10. Kansas	2.36	.96	93
11. Indiana	2.49	.86	99
12. Southern California	2.51	.94	82
13. Florida State	2.64	1.00	93
14. Michigan	2.66	.99	88
15. Massachusetts	2.74	1.14	80
16. Ohio University	2.89	1.15	71
17. Temple	2.96	1.04	67
17. Texas	2.96	.98	74
19. Louisiana State	2.97	1.06	77
20. Colorado	3.02	.90	83
21. Pittsburgh	3.05	.95	60
22. Florida	3.18	1.02	62
22. Utah	3.18	.98	60

TABLE XII. RANKINGS OF OVERALL QUALITY

School	n	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
1. Iowa	68	2.58	1.28
2. Wisconsin	63	2.16	1.23
3. Penn State	50	3.32	1.35
4. Michigan State	44	2.91	1.29
5. Ohio State	36	2.94	1.37
6. Illinois	33	3.76	1.28
6. Northwestern	33	2.94	1.50
8. Purdue	32	3.25	1.37
9. Minnesota	24	3.12	1.33
10. Indiana	18	3.56	1.29
10. Kansas	18	2.61	1.46
12. Florida State	15	3.67	1.23
13. Southern California	13	3.54	1.61
14. Michigan	12	2.58	1.00
15. Temple	8	3.62	1.30
16. Louisiana State	7	4.28	.76
16. Texas	7	3.71	1.60
18. Massachusetts	6	3.33	1.63
18. Ohio University	6	3.83	.75
20. Denver	5	3.20	1.48
21. Berkely	4	3.25	1.50
21. Bowling Green	4	3.50	1.73